SINGULAR DIFFUSION LIMIT OF A TAGGED PARTICLE IN ZERO RANGE PROCESSES WITH SINAI-TYPE RANDOM ENVIRONMENT

MARCEL HUDIANI, CLAUDIO LANDIM, AND SUNDER SETHURAMAN

ABSTRACT. We derive a singular diffusion limit for the position of a tagged particle in zero range interacting particle processes on a one dimensional torus with a Sinai-type random environment via two steps. In the first step, a regularization is introduced by averaging the random environment over an εN -neighborhood. With respect to such an environment, the microscopic drift of the tagged particle is in form $\frac{1}{N}W'_{\varepsilon}$, where W'_{ε} is a regularized White noise. Scaling diffusively, we find the nonequilibrium limit of the tagged particle x_t^{ε} is the unique weak solution of $dx_t^{\varepsilon} = 2 \frac{\Phi(\rho^{\varepsilon}(t,x_t^{\varepsilon}))}{\rho^{\varepsilon}(t,x_t^{\varepsilon})} W'_{\varepsilon}(x_t^{\varepsilon}) + \sqrt{\frac{\Phi(\rho^{\varepsilon}(t,x_t^{\varepsilon}))}{\rho^{\varepsilon}(t,x_t^{\varepsilon})}} dB_t$, in terms of the hydrodynamic mass density ρ^{ε} recently identified and homogenized interaction rate Φ .

In the second step, we show that x^{ε} , as ε vanishes, converges in law to the diffusion x^{0} described informally by $dx_{t}^{0} = 2 \frac{\Phi(\rho^{0}(t,x_{t}^{0}))}{\rho^{0}(t,x_{t}^{0})} W'(x_{t}^{0}) + \sqrt{\frac{\Phi(\rho^{0}(t,x_{t}^{0}))}{\rho^{0}(t,x_{t}^{0})}} dB_{t}$, where W' is a spatial White noise and ρ^{0} is the para-controlled limit of ρ^{ε} also recently identified, solving the singular PDE $\partial_{t}\rho^{0} = \frac{1}{2}\Delta\Phi(\rho^{0}) - 2\nabla(W'\Phi(\rho^{0}))$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of characterizing the motion of a tagged or distinguished particle interacting with others has a long history in statistical physics Sections I.8, II.6 in [23], and as well as in the mathematics literature Section VIII.4 in [18], and Sections 4.3, 8.4 in [13]. Part of the difficulty is that the position X_t of the tagged particle depends on the configuration of the other particles ξ_t , and so is not Markovian with respect to its own history. However, in many settings, one believes that it behaves as a homogenized random walk.

Such results with respect to translation-invariant interacting particle systems, in particular mass conserving exclusion and zero-range processes, on \mathbb{Z}^d have been shown when the initial configuration of particles are governed by a stationary or 'local equilibrium' distributions. See [4][Section 1.4] for a review with respect to exclusion processes, and [21], [9], [10] for a discussion with respect to zero-range models. These descriptions, whether functional law of large numbers or diffusion limits, typically involve the hydrodynamic scaled mass density evolution of the particles in the system.

Recently, a hydrodynamic limit of a zero-range process in a Sinai-type random environment in a one dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}_N = \mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$ was identified in [15], [6], [5] via a two step procedure in terms of a singular, nonlinear stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE). The aim of this article is to study associated scaling behaviors with respect to a tagged particle in such an inhomogeneous system. In a nutshell, the limiting diffusion limit will involve the Sinai-type external random environment, as expressed via the hydrodynamic density and other local averages. A main point is that such a limit formulates a microscopic basis for a class of 'singular' Brox-type diffusions, as we will try to explain.

In this sense, our tagged particle results form a natural complement to the hydrodynamics and SPDE convergences in [15], [6], [5]. These results also generalize the tagged particle diffusion limit in translation invariant zero-range settings without a random environment [9], [10].

²⁰²⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification. 60K35, 60L40, 82C22, 82C44.

To aid in the description of the results in the article, we first discuss several components in the next subsections.

1.1. **Random Environment.** Our environment is built from 'Sinai' random environments on \mathbb{Z} . Namely, consider independent, identically distributed (iid) random variables $\{u_k : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ such that $c \leq u_0 \leq 1 - c$ where $0 < c < \frac{1}{2}$ and $E\left[\log\left(\frac{u_0}{1-u_0}\right)\right] = 0$. Let U_n denote the discrete-time random walk in this random environment (RWRE) with $U_0 = 0$:

$$P(U_{n+1} = U_n + 1 \mid U_n, \{u_k\}) = 1 - P(U_{n+1} = U_n - 1 \mid U_n, \{u_k\}) = u_{U_n}$$
(1.1)

for $n \geq 1$. In [22], it was proved that U_n scales with the order of $(\log n)^2$. Specifically, with $\sigma^2 = E[(\log(u_0(1-u_0)^{-1}))^2] > 0$, the ratio $\sigma^2 U_n/(\log n)^2$ converges weakly in the annealed sense to a non-trivial random variable U_{∞} , whose law does not depend on σ .

A continuous analog of the 'Sinai' RWRE was introduced in [3]. Informally, σ -Brox diffusion is described by the stochastic differential equation (SDE),

$$dX_t^{br} = dB_t - \frac{1}{2}W'(X_t^{br}) dt , \ X_0^{br} = 0$$

Here, B, W_+, W_- are three independent standard Brownian motions on \mathbb{R} , and W is a two-sided Brownian motion: $W(0) = 0, W(x) = \sigma W_+(x)$ for x > 0, and $W(x) = \sigma W_-(-x)$ for x < 0. More rigorously, σ -Brox diffusion is defined in terms of scale and time-change:

$$X_t^{br} = s^{-1}(B_{T^{-1}(t)}) \text{ where } \begin{cases} s(y) = \int_0^y e^{W(z)} dz , y \in \mathbb{R} \\ T(t) = \int_0^t e^{-2W(s^{-1}(B_s))} ds , t \ge 0. \end{cases}$$
(1.2)

Analogous to Sinai RWRE, it was shown in [3], when $\sigma = 1$, that $X_t^{br}/(\log t)^2$ converges in distribution to the same limit U_{∞} .

Interpolating between these two processes, Seignourel considered in [20] environments scaled by \sqrt{N} , where N is a scale parameter. An effective example is $u_k^N = 1/2 + r_k/\sqrt{\sigma^2 N}$ where $\{r_k : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ are i.i.d bounded random variables with mean 0 and variance σ^2 . Consider now the diffusively scaled random walk, denoted U_{\cdot}^N , in this array of random environments. Then, [20] showed $U_{\lfloor N^2 t \rfloor}^N/N$ converges weakly in the annealed sense to the 4-Brox diffusion X_t^{br} .

1.2. Hydrodynamics with Zero-range interactions. The Zero-range process (ZRP) on \mathbb{T}_N follows a collection of continuous time, dependent random walks. If a site $x \in \mathbb{T}_N$ is occupied by j particles, then a particle at x displaces to $y \in \mathbb{T}_N$ at rate (g(j)/j) p(x, y) where $g : \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and p is a transition probability. The model has name 'Zero-range' because the infinitesimal interaction between particles is with those on the same site. We mention the motion of 'independent' particles is a case when $g(j) \equiv j$.

The model in a 'Sinai'-type or 'Seignourel' environment on \mathbb{T}_N is when $p(x, x+1) = u_x^N$ and $p(x, x-1) = 1 - u_x^N$, with p(x, y) = 0 for $y \neq x \pm 1$. Formally, the rate of change of $\eta_t(x) = \xi_{N^2t}(x)$, the number of particles at $x \in \mathbb{T}_N$ in diffusive scale, is given by the generator action

$$N^{2}L\eta(x) \sim \frac{1}{2}\Delta_{N}g(\eta(x)) + 2N\nabla^{N}\left(g(\eta(x))\frac{r_{x}}{\sqrt{\sigma^{2}N}}\right)$$

where $\Delta_N G(x) = N^2(G(x+1) + G(x-1) - 2G(x))$ and $\nabla^N G(x) = N(G(x+1) - G(x))$ are the normalized second-order and first-order differences. Since $r_x = S_x - S_{x-1}$ is the difference of partial sums of $\{r_y\}$, formally $r_x/\sqrt{\sigma^2 N} \sim W(x/N) - W((x-1)/N)$ where W is a spatial standard Brownian motion. In this way, one can postulate that $\pi_t^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \eta_t(x) \delta_{x/N}$ converges to $\rho(t, x) dx$ where

$$\partial_t \rho = \frac{1}{2} \Delta \Phi(\rho) - 2\nabla \big(W'(x) \Phi(\rho) \big)$$
(1.3)

and Φ is a homogenization of the process rate g. Such an equation, a form of a generalized nonlinear parabolic Anderson model, is a singular SPDE since $\nabla W' \in C^{-3/2-}$ and $\rho \in C^{1/2-}$ (and therefore $\Phi(\rho) \in C^{1/2-}$).

Although this 'direct' limit is still open, by considering a two step approach (1.3) was recovered as follows. In the first step, after 'regularizing' the random environment, that is by replacing r_k^N/\sqrt{N} at a site $k = \lfloor xN \rfloor$ by its average over a small ε -macroscopic block

$$\frac{1}{2N\varepsilon} \sum_{|i-k| \le N\varepsilon} r_i^N \sim \frac{1}{2N\varepsilon} \left[S_{k+N\varepsilon} / \sqrt{N} - S_{k-N\varepsilon} / \sqrt{N} \right] \sim \frac{1}{2N\varepsilon} \left[W(x+\varepsilon) - W(x-\varepsilon) \right], \quad (1.4)$$

both quenched and annealed hydrodynamic limits are found in [15] with a density ρ^{ε} satisfying a regularized form of (1.3), where W' is replaced with W'_{ε} , a regularized White noise (cf. Theorem 2.7, Corollary 2.10). In the second step, the densities $\rho(t, x) = \rho^{\varepsilon}(t, x)$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ are shown to converge uniformly in a certain space in probability with respect to W to ρ^0 , the para-controlled solution of the singular SPDE (1.3) (cf. Theorem 2.13); see [8] for an in-depth account of para-controlled distributions.

1.3. Discussion of results for a tagged particle. Let X_t be the location of a tagged particle at time t in the system. The diffusively scaled position $\frac{1}{N}X_t^N = \frac{1}{N}X_{N^2t}$ is approximately given as

$$\frac{1}{N}X_t^N - \frac{1}{N}X_0^N \sim 2\int_0^t \frac{g(\eta_s(X_s^N))}{\eta_s(X_s^N)}W_\varepsilon'(X_s^N)ds + \frac{1}{N}M_t^N,$$

in terms of a martingale $\frac{1}{N}M_t^N$ with quadratic variation $\int_0^t \frac{g(\eta_s(X_s^N))}{\eta_s(X_s^N)} ds$.

Given the quenched hydrodynamics proved in the 'first step' with fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, one hypothesizes that $\frac{1}{N}X_t^N$ converges to x_t^{ε} satisfying the stochastic differential equation (SDE),

$$dx_t^{\varepsilon} = 2 \frac{\Phi(\rho(t, x_t^{\varepsilon}))}{\rho(t, x_t^{\varepsilon})} W_{\varepsilon}'(x_t^{\varepsilon}) + \sqrt{\frac{\Phi(\rho(t, x_t^{\varepsilon}))}{\rho(t, x_t^{\varepsilon})}} dB_t.$$
(1.5)

And in the 'second' step, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, one would hope to obtain that x_t^{ε} converges in a suitable sense to x_t^0 , satisfying formally the SDE with W' replacing W'_{ε} , and more rigorously given in terms of a scale and time-change functions. These aims were initially mentioned as an open problem in [15].

A general form of the first step, where x_t^{ε} is a weak solution of (1.5), is proved in Theorem 3.1 with respect to an abstract disorder $\{\alpha_k^N : k \in \mathbb{T}_N\}$ approximating $\alpha(\cdot) \in C(\mathbb{T})$. Then, quenched and annealed limits are found in Corollary 3.3 when $\alpha = W_{\varepsilon}'$. For the second step, we state quenched and annealed forms for convergence in distribution of x_t^{ε} to the singular diffusion limit x_t^0 as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ in Theorem 3.4. We refer to the diffusion x_t^0 as 'singular' as it involves the para-controlled solution ρ^0 of (1.3) and the multiplicative external noise W'. Derivation of such a 'singular' diffusion from microscopic interactions, albeit in two steps, appears to be one of the first of its kind.

We comment, in the case of independent particles, when $g(n) \equiv n$, we have $\Phi(\rho) \equiv \rho$. The first step limit x^{ε} would then satisfy a regularized form of Brox diffusion, $dx_t^{\varepsilon} = 2W_{\varepsilon}'(x_t^{\varepsilon})dt + dB_t$, while in the second step, the limits of these would be to 4-Brox diffusion $x_t^0 = X_t^{br}$.

In another direction, as mentioned earlier, the results reduce to the tagged particle diffusion limits with respect to translation-invariant Zero-range where $p(x, x \pm 1) = 1/2$, if there is no random environment. That is, if α , W'_{ε} and W' were set to 0, one would recover the time-changed Brownian motion limits in [9], [10].

Finally, we comment that the proof methods allow for other disorders and that related singular diffusion limits can be shown. For instance, in in Remark 3.5 we discuss limits with respect to 'Brownian-bridge' disorders.

1.4. **Proof ideas.** The main idea in the first step (Theorem 3.1) is to replace the local function $g(\eta_t(X_t^N))/\eta_t(X_t^N)$ by a function of the mass density $\rho(t, X_t^N)$ at X_t^N . The intuition is that at a scaled time N^2t , the particles in local neighborhoods have had time to mix: locally, the distribution of particles should be in some sort of equilibrium. The form of this 'equilibrium', since the effects of the random environment are of order $O(1/(N\varepsilon))$ (cf. (1.4)), with sufficient mixing estimates, may be approximated by that when the model is translation-invariant, without random environment.

Then, $g(\eta_t(X_t^N))/\eta_t(X_t^N)$ should homogenize to its expected value under an invariant measure ν_{ρ}^N for the process (X_t^N, η_t) without random environment associated to the local density $\rho = \rho(t, x_t)$. If we condition on the location of X_t^N and then shift the frame so that X_t^N is at the origin, the homogenization would be in form $H(\rho) = E_{\nu_{\rho}^0} \left[\frac{g(\eta(0))}{\eta(0)} \right]$, the expectation with respect to a 'frame' measure denoted ν_{ρ}^0 . Since the tagged particle is at the origin, ν_{ρ}^0 can be computed in terms of a size bias with respect to the stationary distribution \mathscr{R}_{ρ} of the process governing indistinguishable particles, $\nu_{\rho}^0 = (\eta(0)/\rho)\mathscr{R}_{\rho}$. Then, $H(\rho)$ will have formulation $H(\rho) = E_{\mathscr{R}_{\rho}} \left[g(\eta(0))/\rho \right] = \frac{\Phi(\rho)}{\rho}$.

This homogenization, in the presence of the random environment, is made precise in the 'replacement' Lemma 4.1, an important part of the proof of the 'first step' result. The scheme of proof of Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.3 is similar to that in [9], [10] without a random environment. However, due to the inhomogeneity of the random environment, there are many differences.

Indeed, the form of the stationary distribution of the process (X_t^N, η_t) involves the structure of the random environment as in the hydrodynamics work [15]. It will be important to make local particle number truncations to perform the replacements. We use 'monotone coupling', allowed under an 'attractiveness' assumption on g (namely that g is an increasing function), to deduce sufficient truncations, along with estimates on the inhomogeneous stationary distribution in [15] to carry out the homogenizations. The smoothness of the initial continuum density $\rho_0 \in C^{\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta > 0$ assumed in Theorem 3.1 allows to deduce continuity of $\rho(t, x) = \rho^{\varepsilon}(t, x)$ (not shown in [15]), important to close the local homogenizations and resulting equations. We comment in the presence of translation-invariance, and linear growth assumptions on g, local particle truncations were avoided in [9], while 'attractiveness' was also used in [10] to the treat sublinearity of the rate g assumed there.

From Theorem 3.1, one can recover immediately the quenched part of Corollary 3.3 when $\alpha = W'_{\varepsilon}$. The annealed part in Corollary 3.3 will follow as a consequence.

To recover quenched and annealed Brox-type diffusion limits x^0 in the second step when $\alpha = W_{\varepsilon}'$ (Theorem 3.4), we apply the Itô-McKean representation of x^{ε} in terms of scale s^{ε} and time-change T^{ε} . With linear growth bound assumptions on g, and additional smoothness of the initial density $\rho_0 \in C^{1+\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta > 0$, we may verify $\rho = \rho^{\varepsilon}$ is a classical solution, allowing to plug into the framework of the para-controlled limit Theorem 2.13. Then, with uniform convergence limits of ρ^{ε} to ρ^0 afforded by the para-controlled limit, we will be able to take limit of s^{ε} and T^{ε} to s^0 and T^0 as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. In the end, the Itô-McKean form of the limit describes the diffusion x^0 in Theorem 3.4.

Plan of the article. After specifying more carefully the model in Section 2 and relevant results and consequences in the literature, we turn to our results for a tagged particle (Theorem 3.1, Corollary 3.3, and Theorem 3.4) in Section 3. In Section 4, we give the proof of Theorem 3.1, assuming a replacement Lemma 4.1. In Section 5, we show Theorem 3.4. Finally, in Sections 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3, we complete the proof of Lemma 4.1 in three parts via 'local 1-block', 'local 2-block', and 'global replacement' estimates respectively.

2. Model description

Let $\mathbb{T}_N := \mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$ be the discrete torus for $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Throughout this article, we will identify \mathbb{T}_N with $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ and also identify the continuum unit torus \mathbb{T} with (0, 1]. Consider a deterministic

'environment' on the discrete torus $\{\alpha_k^N : k \in \mathbb{T}_N\}$ such that their linear interpolations for $u \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$Y_u^N = \alpha_{\lfloor Nu \rfloor}^N + (Nu - \lfloor Nu \rfloor) \alpha_{\lfloor Nu \rfloor + 1}^N,$$

converge uniformly to $\alpha(u)$ where $\alpha(\cdot)$ is a continuous function on \mathbb{T} .

We now introduce the zero-range process on \mathbb{T}_N with respect to this environment. Let $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$, and let $\Sigma_N = \mathbb{N}_0^{\mathbb{T}_N}$ be the (countable) configuration space of particles. For a particle configuration $\xi \in \Sigma_N$, the coordinate $\xi(k)$ for $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$ denotes the number of particles at site k.

With respect to a function $g: \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{R}_+$, denote by ξ_t for $t \ge 0$ the continuous-time Markov chain, informally described as follows. Since $\max_{1\le k\le N} |\alpha_k^N|$ is uniformly bounded in N, take Nsufficiently large so that $|\alpha_k^N|/N < 1/2$ for all $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$. At each location $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$, a clock rings at rate $g(\xi_t(k))$, at which time a particle is selected at random from those at k to move to $k \pm 1$ with probability $(1/2) \pm (\alpha_k^N/N)$. The case $g(j) \equiv j$ corresponds to when all the particles in the system are independent, each carrying its own exponential rate 1 clock.

More precisely, what we call the 'standard' process $\{\xi_t : t \ge 0\}$ is the Markov continuous time jump process on Σ_N , with generator L given by

$$Lf(\xi) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{T}_N} \left\{ g(\xi(k)) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\alpha_k^N}{N} \right) \left(f(\xi^{k,k+1}) - f(\xi) \right) + g(\xi(k)) \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha_k^N}{N} \right) \left(f(\xi^{k,k-1}) - f(\xi) \right) \right\}.$$
(2.1)

Here, $\xi^{j,k}$ is the configuration obtained from ξ by moving a particle from j to k, that is,

$$\xi^{j,k}(\ell) = \begin{cases} \xi(j) - 1 & \ell = j ,\\ \xi(k) + 1 & \ell = k ,\\ \xi(\ell) & \ell \neq j , k \end{cases}$$

Our main focus will be the behavior of a tagged or distinguished particle in the system. Let X_t denote the location of the tagged particle in \mathbb{T}_N at time $t \ge 0$. Since the dynamics of a particle depends on the location of the other particles, the process X_t by itself is not Markovian. However, we may consider the coupled process (X_t, ξ_t) on $\{(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{T}_N \times \Sigma_N : \xi(x) \ge 1\}$ with respect to the deterministic environment $\{\alpha_x^N\}$. Such a process is Markovian with generator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{L}_{N}f(x,\xi) &= \sum_{\pm} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{T}_{N} \setminus \{x\}} \left\{ g(\xi(y)) p_{y}^{N,\pm}(f(x,\xi^{y,y\pm1}) - f(x,\xi)) + g(\xi(x)) \frac{\xi(x) - 1}{\xi(x)} p_{x}^{N,\pm}(f(x,\xi^{x,x\pm1}) - f(x,\xi)) + g(\xi(x)) \frac{1}{\xi(x)} p_{x}^{N,\pm}(f(x\pm1,\xi^{x,x\pm1}) - f(x,\xi)) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$
(2.2)

where $p_x^{N,\pm} := \frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{\alpha_x^N}{N}$.

Of course, \mathscr{L}_N restricted to functions $f(x,\xi) = f(\xi)$ only of the configuration ξ reduces to L.

We also observe the restriction of \mathscr{L}_N to functions $f(x,\xi) = f(x_0,\xi)$, for a fixed $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}_N$, is itself a generator of the process ξ_t where $\xi_t(x_0) \ge 1$ and the tagged particle does not move, but is always at $X_0 = x_0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{L}_{N}^{env,x}f(x_{0},\xi) &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{T}_{N} \setminus \{x_{0}\}} g(\xi(y)) \left[p_{y}^{N,+}(f(x_{0},\xi^{y,y+1}) - f(x_{0},\xi)) + p_{y}^{N,-}(f(x_{0},\xi^{y,y-1}) - f(x_{0},\xi)) \right] \\ &+ g(\xi(x_{0})) \frac{\xi(x_{0}) - 1}{\xi(x_{0})} \left[p_{x_{0}}^{N,+}(f(x_{0},\xi^{x_{0},x_{0}+1}) - f(x_{0},\xi)) + p_{x_{0}}^{N,-}(f(x_{0},\xi^{x_{0},x_{0}-1}) - f(x_{0},\xi)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For each N, we will later observe the evolution of the tagged particle and zero-range process when time is speeded up by N^2 . We define processes

$$X_t^N := X_{N^2t}$$
 and $\eta_t := \xi_{N^2t}$,

generated by $N^2 \mathscr{L}_N$ for times $0 \le t \le T$, where T > 0 can be any fixed time horizon.

2.1. Assumptions on g. To avoid degeneracies, we suppose that g(0) = 0 and g(k) > 0 for $k \ge 1$. We now state further conditions on g that we will use in various combinations in the main theorems:

- (A) $g(k+1) \ge g(k)$ for $k \ge 0$;
- (LG) $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |g(k+1) g(k)| \le g^* < \infty;$
- (M) There is an $m \ge 1$ and $a_0 > 0$ such that $g(k+m) g(k) \ge a_0 >$ for $k \ge 0$.

We mention how these properties are used in several places to make estimates.

Condition (A), often called 'attractiveness' allows a 'basic coupling' (cf. [1], [18], Theorem II.5.2 in [13]): If dR and dR' are initial measures of two standard processes ξ_0 and ξ'_0 at time t = 0, and $dR \ll dR'$ in stochastic order, then the distributions of ξ_t and ξ'_t at times $t \ge 0$ are similarly stochastically ordered. We will primarily use (A) to bound above and below mean local particle densities at sites, and to make 'log(N)' site particle truncations Lemma 2.6 in the 1 and 2-blocks replacement estimates Lemmas 6.3 and 6.6.

Condition (LG) is used in several places to bound $g(j) \leq g^*j$, and also in the 1 and 2 block estimates. Condition (M) is used to deduce $g(j)/j \geq g_*$ for a positive constant g_* . Such bounds are used to plug into assumptions for the singular hydrodynamic limit Theorem 2.13. One also deduces (LG) and (M) give that $j \geq 1 \mapsto g(j)/j$ is Lipschitz: $|g(j)/j - g(m)/m| \leq |g(j) - g(m)|/j + g(m)|j - m|/(mj) \leq 2(g^*/j)|j - m| \leq 2g^*|j - m|$.

Importantly, also in combination, (LG), (M) imply a mixing property of the process: Let $b_{l,j}$ be the inverse of the spectral gap of the standard process with reflecting boundary conditions, in a null environment that is when $\alpha_k^N \equiv 0$, defined on the cube $\Lambda_l = \{-l, \ldots, l\}$ with j particles; see Section 6.1.2 for precise definitions. Under (LG) and (M) we have

$$b_{l,j} = O(l^2),$$
 (2.3)

uniformly in $j \ge 0$ [16]. Such a bound is used to compare the inhomogeneous system in the environment $\{\alpha_k^N\}$ with a translation-invariant system, when $\alpha_k^N \equiv 0$.

We comment that, although [9] also assumed (LG) and (M), a more general class of g's might be considered. Especially, (M) might be relaxed so that bounded or sublinear rate processes are allowed for the regularized tagged particle limit (Theorem 3.1) as in the work [10]. However, (LG), (M) give that $g_*j \leq g(j) \leq g^*j$ and therefore $g_* \leq \Phi(\rho)/\rho \leq g^*$ (cf. (2.7)), an assumption in [6], [5]. Since these citations play a role in the singular diffusion limit Theorem 3.4, to have a unified set of assumptions, we have specified the class as above.

2.2. Quenched random environment formulation. Let $\{r_x\}_{x\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with mean 0 and variance $0 < \sigma^2 < \infty$. Let $s_0 = 0$ and for $n \ge 1$, let $s_n = \sum_{k=1}^n r_k$. For $0 \le u \le 1$, let

$$Y_u^N = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{N}} s_{\lfloor Nu \rfloor} + \frac{Nu - \lfloor Nu \rfloor}{\sigma\sqrt{N}} r_{\lfloor Nu \rfloor + 1} \; ,$$

where $|a|, a \in \mathbb{R}$ stands for the integer part of a.

It is standard that the random functions $\{Y_u^N : 0 \le u \le 1\}$ converge in distribution as $N \uparrow \infty$ to the Brownian motion on [0,1]. By Skorokhod's Representation Theorem, we may find a probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathscr{P})$ and $\{W_u^N : 0 \le u \le 1\}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, mappings from Ω to C[0,1], such that, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\{Y_u^N : 0 \le u \le 1\} = \{W_u^N : 0 \le u \le 1\}$$

in distribution and moreover, $\{W_u^N : 0 \le u \le 1\}$ converges uniformly almost surely to the standard Brownian motion $\{W_u, 0 \le u \le 1\}$.

We will now fix an $\omega \in \Omega$ such that $\{W_u^N(\omega) : 0 \le u \le 1\}$ converges (uniformly) to a Brownian path $\{W_u(\omega) : 0 \le u \le 1\}$.

Following the formulation in [15], we extend W_u^N as well as W_u to $u \in [-1, 2]$. With \tilde{W}_u representing either W_u^N or W_u , define

$$\tilde{W}_u = \begin{cases} \tilde{W}_{u+1} - \tilde{W}_1 & u \in [-1, 0), \\ \tilde{W}_{u-1} + \tilde{W}_1 & u \in (1, 2]. \end{cases}$$

Here, in the time intervals [-1,0) and (1,2], the trajectory \tilde{W} starts respectively from $-\tilde{W}_1$ and \tilde{W}_1 , then displaces according to \tilde{W} in [0,1]. In this way, the increments of \tilde{W} are periodic in \mathbb{T} . To simplify notation, we will drop the tilde in the notation for \tilde{W} .

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a parameter. Let also $\psi : [-1, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a C^1 function with $\int_{-1}^{1} \psi(x) dx = 1$. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$, consider an ε -regularization of local environments such that

$$q_k^N \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{\sigma N} \sum_{|j-k| \le \lfloor N\varepsilon \rfloor} r_j \left[\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \psi(\frac{j-k}{N\varepsilon}) \right],$$

namely

$$q_k^N := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N\varepsilon}} \sum_{j=k-\lfloor N\varepsilon \rfloor}^{k+\lfloor N\varepsilon \rfloor-1} W_j^N \left[\psi(\frac{j-k}{N\varepsilon}) - \psi(\frac{j-k+1}{N\varepsilon}) \right] \\ + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N\varepsilon}} W_{k+N\varepsilon}^N \psi(\frac{\lfloor N\varepsilon \rfloor}{N\varepsilon}) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{N\varepsilon}} W_{k-1-N\varepsilon}^N \psi(-\frac{\lfloor N\varepsilon \rfloor}{N\varepsilon}) .$$
(2.4)

In particular, when $k/N \to x \in \mathbb{T}$ as $N \uparrow \infty,$ we have $\sqrt{N} q_k^N$ converges to

$$-\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \int_{x-\varepsilon}^{x+\varepsilon} W(u)\psi'(\frac{u-x}{\varepsilon})du + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \{W(x+\varepsilon)\psi(1) - W(x-\varepsilon)\psi(-1)\}$$

$$= \frac{d}{dx}W * \psi_{\varepsilon}(x) =: W'_{\varepsilon}(x),$$
(2.5)

where $\psi_{\varepsilon}(u) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\psi(u/\varepsilon)$.

As W^N_{\cdot} converges uniformly to W_{\cdot} , by the continuity of W, and the properties of ψ , in view of (2.4), there exists a constant $C = C(\omega) < \infty$ such that

$$\limsup_{N \to \infty} \max_{1 \le k \le N} \left\{ \sqrt{N} \left| q_k^N \right| \right\} \le C/\varepsilon \; .$$

As remarked in the introduction, W'_{ε} is a smoothing of W'. In particular, $W'_{\varepsilon} \in C^{\gamma}$ when $\psi' \in C^{\gamma}$ for $\gamma \ge 1/2$ and $\psi(\pm 1) = 0$. When one of $\psi(1)$ or $\psi(-1)$ does not vanish, then $W'_{\varepsilon} \in C^{1/2-} := \bigcap_{0 < \epsilon < 1/2} C^{1/2-\epsilon}$. Also, when $\psi' \in C^{\gamma}$ for $\gamma < 1/2$, then $W'_{\varepsilon} \in C^{1/2-}$. A natural case is when $\psi(x) = (1/2) \mathbb{1}_{[-1,1]}(x)$ for which $W'_{\varepsilon}(x) = (2\varepsilon)^{-1}[W(x+\varepsilon) - W(x-\varepsilon)]$.

Here, and for later use, we denote by $C^{\gamma}(\mathbb{Y})$ for $\gamma \geq 0$, and by $C^{\gamma_1,\gamma_2}(\mathbb{Y})$ for $\gamma_1,\gamma_2 \geq 0$, the standard Hölder spaces of functions on respective spaces \mathbb{Y} .

In this article, with respect to the above quenched setting, we focus on the deterministic sequence

$$\alpha_k^N \equiv \sqrt{N} q_k^N \text{ and } \alpha(u) \equiv W'_{\varepsilon}(u),$$
(2.6)

although other periodic sequences, such as $a_k^N \equiv \alpha_k^N - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{T}_N} \alpha_j^N$ and the limit $a(u) \equiv W'_{\varepsilon}(u) - \int_{\mathbb{T}} W'_{\varepsilon}(v) dv$, which corresponds to Brownian-bridge random environments, could be considered.

2.3. Invariant measures. We first consider invariant measures for L, generating the standard process of indistinguished particles. Then, we consider invariant measures for the system with a tagged particle generated by \mathscr{L}_N . In the following, with respect to a given probability measure μ , we denote by E_{μ} and Var_{μ} its expectation and variance.

The building block for the invariant measures of L is $\{\mathcal{P}_{\phi}\}$, a family of Poisson-like distributions indexed by 'fugacities' $\phi \geq 0$. For each ϕ , the measure \mathcal{P}_{ϕ} on \mathbb{N}_0 is defined by

$$\mathcal{P}_{\phi}(n) = \frac{1}{\mathscr{Z}(\phi)} \frac{\phi^n}{g(n)!}, \quad \text{for } n \ge 0,$$

where

$$\mathscr{Z}(\phi) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\phi^k}{g(k)!}$$
 and $g(n)! = g(n) g(n-1) \cdots g(1)$, $g(0)! = 1$.

The family $\{\mathcal{P}_{\phi} : \phi \in [0, \phi^*)\}$ is well defined where ϕ^* is the radius of convergence for \mathscr{Z} . Under condition (M), $\phi^* = \lim_{j \uparrow \infty} g(j) = \infty$. Hence, \mathcal{P}_{ϕ} satisfies the (FEM) condition in p. 69 of [13].

Let $R(\phi) = E_{\mathcal{P}_{\phi}}[Z]$, where Z(n) = n, be the mean of the distribution \mathcal{P}_{ϕ} . A direct computation yields $R'(\phi) > 0$, R(0) = 0 and, as $\phi^* = \infty$, we have $\lim_{\phi \to \phi^*} R(\phi) = \infty$. Since R is strictly increasing, it has an inverse, denoted by $\Phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$, which is also strictly increasing with $\Phi(0) = 0$. We may parametrize the family of distributions \mathcal{P}_{ϕ} by its mean. For $\rho \ge 0$, let $\mathcal{Q}_{\rho} = \mathcal{P}_{\Phi(\rho)}$, so that $E_{\mathcal{Q}_{\rho}}[Z] = E_{\mathcal{P}_{\Phi(\rho)}}[Z] = R(\Phi(\rho)) = \rho$.

A straightforward computation yields that $E_{\mathcal{P}_{\phi}}[g(Z)] = \phi$ for $0 \leq \phi \leq \phi^* = \infty$. Thus,

$$\Phi(\rho) = E_{\mathcal{P}_{\Phi(\rho)}}[g(Z)] = E_{\mathcal{Q}_{\rho}}[g(Z)] , \quad \rho \ge 0 .$$
(2.7)

Recall, under condition (LG) that $g(k) \leq g^*k$, and therefore $\Phi(\rho) \leq g^*\rho$. Under (M), recall there is $g_* > 0$ such that $g(k) \geq g_*k$, and so $\Phi(\rho) \geq g_*\rho$. A simple computation yields that $\Phi'(\rho) = \Phi(\rho)/\sigma^2(\rho)$ where $\sigma^2(\rho)$ is the variance of Z under \mathcal{Q}_{ρ} . Moreover, one may compute that $\Phi \in C^{\infty}$ is a smooth function.

We note, in the case $g(k) \equiv k$, that $\Phi(\rho) \equiv \rho$, and \mathcal{P}_{ϕ} is a Poisson measure with mean ϕ .

Fix a vector $(\phi_{k,N} : k \in \mathbb{T}_N)$ of non-negative real numbers. Denote by $\mathscr{R}_N = \mathscr{R}_N(\cdot; \{\phi_{k,N}\})$ the product measure on $\mathbb{N}_0^{\mathbb{T}_N}$ whose marginals are given by

$$\mathscr{R}_N(\xi(k) = n) = \mathcal{P}_{\phi_{k,N}}(n), \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{T}_N, n \ge 0.$$
(2.8)

It is straightforward (cf. [1]) to check that \mathscr{R}_N is invariant with respect to the generator L in (2.1) as long as the fugacities $\{\phi_{k,N}\}_{k\in\mathbb{T}_N}$ satisfy:

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\alpha_{k-1}^N}{N}\right)\phi_{k-1,N} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha_{k+1}^N}{N}\right)\phi_{k+1,N} = \phi_{k,N}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$
(2.9)

Notice that $\{c\phi_{k,N}\}_{k\in\mathbb{T}_N}$, for $c \ge 0$, is a solution of (2.9) if $\{\phi_{k,N}\}_{k\in\mathbb{T}_N}$ is a solution. In particular, any solution gives rise to a one-parameter family of solutions $\mathscr{R}_{N,c} = \mathscr{R}_N(\cdot; \{c\phi_{k,N}\})$ for $c \ge 0$. In Lemma 2.1 in [15], it is shown that (2.9) admits a solution, unique up to multiplicative constant, that is strictly positive.

We now restate the following useful estimates of the 'fugacities' given in Lemma 2.2 in [15]. Let $\phi_{\max,N} = \max_{1 \le k \le N} {\phi_{k,N}}$ and $\phi_{\min,N} = \min_{1 \le k \le N} {\phi_{k,N}}$.

Lemma 2.1. Let $\{\phi_{k,N}\}_{k\in\mathbb{T}_N}$ be a solution of (2.9). Then, there exist constants $C_1, C_2 < \infty$ such that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$1 \le \frac{\phi_{\max,N}}{\phi_{\min,N}} \le C_1 \quad and \quad \max_{1 \le k \le N} |\phi_{k,N} - \phi_{k+1,N}| \le \frac{C_2}{N} \phi_{\max,N}.$$

As a consequence, if $\phi_{\max,N} = C$ then $\phi_{\min,N} \ge CC_1^{-1} > 0$.

Let $\{\rho_{k,N} = E_{\mathcal{P}_{\phi_{k,N}}}[Z]\}_{k \in \mathbb{T}_N}$ be the mean values where $\{\phi_{k,N}\}_{k \in \mathbb{T}_N}$ satisfies (2.9). Since by Lemma 2.1, the parameters $\phi_{k,N}$ are uniformly bounded above and below, we have that $\rho_{k,N}$ is also uniformly bounded above and below.

We now turn to stationary measures for the process (X_t, ξ_t) generated by \mathscr{L}_N .

Proposition 2.2. The measure ν^N on $\mathbb{T}_N \times \Sigma_N$ given by

$$\nu^{N}(x,\xi) = \frac{\xi(x)}{\sum_{y \in \mathbb{T}_{N}} \rho_{y,N}} \mathscr{R}_{N}(\xi)$$
(2.10)

is invariant for the joint process generated by \mathscr{L}_N . Moreover, for each fixed $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}_N$, the measure ν^{env,x_0} on Σ_N given by $\nu^{env,x_0}(\xi) = \nu^N(\xi|X = x_0) = \frac{\xi(x_0)}{\rho_{x_0,N}} \mathscr{R}_N(\xi)$ is invariant for the process generated by \mathscr{L}_N^{env,x_0} .

We comment, analogous to the invariant measures of L, since the parameters $\{\phi_{k,N}\}_{k\in\mathbb{T}_N}$ when multiplied by a constant c still satisfy (2.9), the joint process generated by \mathscr{L}_N also has a family of invariant measures indexed by $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

The proof of Proposition 2.2 is a straightforward but long computation. In particular, we may compute the $L^2(\nu^N)$ adjoint \mathscr{L}_N^* as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{L}_{N}^{*}f(x,\xi) &= \sum_{y \neq x} \sum_{\pm} \left(f(x,\xi^{y,y\pm 1}) - f(x,\xi) \right) g(\xi(y)) p_{y\pm 1}^{N,\mp} \frac{\phi_{y\pm 1,N}}{\phi_{y,N}} \\ &+ \sum_{\pm} \left(f(x,\xi^{x,x\pm 1}) - f(x,\xi) \right) g(\xi(x)) \frac{\xi(x) - 1}{\xi(x)} p_{x\pm 1,N}^{N,\mp} \frac{\phi_{x\pm 1,N}}{\phi_{x,N}} \\ &+ \sum_{\pm} \left(f(x\pm 1,\xi^{x,x\pm 1}) - f(x,\xi) \right) \frac{g(\xi(x))}{\xi(x)} p_{x\pm 1}^{N,\mp} \frac{\phi_{x\pm 1,N}}{\phi_{x,N}}. \end{aligned}$$

We also find the $L^2(\nu^{env,x_0})$ adjoint of \mathscr{L}^{env,x_0} , denoted $\mathscr{L}_N^{*,env,x_0}$, is the operator restricted to functions $f(x,\xi) = f(x_0,\xi)$ where $X = x_0$ is fixed. The relations $\mathscr{L}_N^* 1 = \mathscr{L}^{*,env,x_0} 1 = 0$ imply invariance of ν^N and ν^{env,x_0} .

We comment in passing, as shown by a straightforward computation, that ν^N is reversible, that is $\mathscr{L}_N = \mathscr{L}_N^*$, exactly when $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \alpha_x^N = 0$. For instance, the Brownian bridge sequence a_k^N and a(u) given near (2.6) would satisfy this condition.

2.4. Invariant measures for the translation-invariant process. When $\alpha_{\cdot}^{N} \equiv 0$, that is in the translation-invariant setting, $\phi_{k,N} \equiv \phi$ is constant in k. Let ρ be the mean of \mathcal{P}_{ϕ} . Then, we may write the fugacity $\phi = \Phi(\rho)$. In this case, the stationary measure ν^{N} of (X_{t}, ξ_{t}) reduces to the measure denoted as

$$\nu_{\rho}^{N}(x,\xi) = \frac{\xi(x)}{N\rho} \mathscr{R}_{\rho},$$

where $\mathscr{R}_{\rho} = \prod_{k \in \mathbb{T}_N} \mathcal{P}_{\Phi(\rho)}$. Note that the conditional measure, denoted ν_{ρ}^0 in the introduction, satisfies $\nu_{\rho}^0 = \nu_{\rho}^N(\xi \in \cdot | X = 0) = \frac{\xi(0)}{\rho} \mathscr{R}_{\rho}(\xi \in \cdot)$. We comment that the measures $\{\mathscr{R}_{\rho}\}_{\rho \geq 0}$ are well-known as stationary distributions of the translation-invariant process ξ . governed by L when $\alpha_{\cdot}^N \equiv 0$ (cf. [9], [10]).

2.5. Initial measures. We specify now conditions on the initial measures μ^N for the zero-range process with a tagged particle (X_t, ξ_t) generated by \mathscr{L}_N . Denote by μ_X^N and μ_L^N the marginals with respect to X and ξ on spaces \mathbb{T}_N and Σ_N respectively.

We now fix \mathscr{R}_N (cf. (2.8)) to be the invariant measure for ξ_t chosen so that $\phi_{\max,N} = \max_{k \in \mathbb{T}_N} \{\phi_{k,N}\} = 1$. Such a choice specifies the normalization or parameter *c* multiplying a solution $\phi_{k,N}$. We comment other parameter values could be also be used. Since the fugacities

 $\phi_{x,N} \leq \phi_{max,N} = 1$, the maximum density $\rho_{max,N}$ (corresponding to $\phi_{max,N}$) is bounded uniformly in N.

Let ν^N be the associated invariant measure defined in terms of \mathscr{R}_N (cf. (2.10)). Define the relative entropy between measures μ_1 and μ_2 by $\mathscr{H}(\mu_1|\mu_2) := \int f \ln f \, d\mu_2$ where $f = d\mu_1/d\mu_2$.

Condition 2.3. The measure μ^N satisfies the following.

(a) We have $\{\mu_L^N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ is associated with an initial density profile $\rho_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta \ge 0$ in the sense that for any $G \in C(\mathbb{T})$ and $\delta > 0$

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \mu_L^N \left[\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{T}_N} G\left(\frac{k}{N}\right) \xi(k) - \int_{\mathbb{T}} G(x) \rho_0(x) dx \right| > \delta \right] = 0.$$

- (b) The relative entropy of μ_L^N with respect to \mathscr{R}_N is of order N. That is, there exists a finite constant C_0 such that $\mathscr{H}(\mu_L^N | \mathscr{R}_N) \leq C_0 N$ for all $N \geq 1$.
- (c) We have {μ_X^N}_{N∈ℕ} converges weakly to the law of a random variable Z_X on T.
 (d) The relative entropy of μ^N with respect to ν^N is of order N: There is a finite constant C₀ such that ℋ(μ^N|ν^N) ≤ C₀N for all N ≥ 1.
 (e) The marginal μ_L^N is stochastically bounded above and below, ℛ_{N,c0} ≪ μ_L^N ≪ ℛ_{N,c1} for
- $0 < c_0 < c_1 < \infty$. That is, for any increasing coordinatewise function $f: \Sigma_N \to \mathbb{R}$, we have $E_{\mathscr{R}_{N,c_0}}[f] \leq E_{\mu_L^N}[f] \leq E_{\mathscr{R}_{N,c_1}}[f]$. As a consequence, by Lemma 2.1 and properties of \mathcal{P}_{ϕ} , there is $0 < \rho_{-} = \rho_{-}(c_{0}) < \rho_{+}(c_{1}) = \rho_{+} < \infty$ such that $\mathscr{R}_{\rho_{-}} \ll \mathscr{R}_{N,c_{0}}$ and $\mathscr{R}_{N,c_{1}} \ll \mathscr{R}_{\rho_{+}}$. In particular, $\rho_{-} \leq \min_{k \in \mathbb{T}_{N}} E_{\mu_{L}^{N}}[\xi(k)] \leq \max_{k \in \mathbb{T}_{N}} E_{\mu_{L}^{N}}[\xi(k)] \leq \rho_{+}$.

These are natural conditions and also those which allow to fit into the results in [15] and [6], [5]: (a) specifies an initial law of large numbers for the bulk particle numbers; we will chose later on in some of the results that $\rho_0 \in C^{\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ for different ranges of $\beta \geq 0$. (b) gives that the initial marginal may differ from the stationary measure \mathscr{R}_N at O(N) locations of \mathbb{T}_N in the sense of relative entropy. (c) specifies that the initial tagged particle position has a weak limit. (d) states that the full initial measure μ^N may differ from the stationary measure ν^N in the sense of O(N)-relative entropy; such a condition is useful to get control of later time distributions of the joint process. Finally, (e) allows the monotone coupling mentioned earlier, so that we may bound and truncate local particle numbers; for instance, as in the next Section 2.7.

In the following, we will denote the process measure and associated expectation governing η_{i} starting from κ by \mathbb{P}_{κ} and \mathbb{E}_{κ} . When the particle system process starts from $\{\mu^N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying Condition 2.3, we will denote by $\mathbb{P}_N := \mathbb{P}_{\mu^N}$ and $\mathbb{E}_N := \mathbb{E}_{\mu^N}$, the associated process measure and expectation.

2.6. Local equilibrium measures. We observe that Condition 2.3 is satisfied, for example, by 'local equilibrium' measures $\{\mu_{le}^N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ associated to macroscopic profiles $\rho_0 \in C^{\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta \geq 0$ such that $0 < \rho_{-} \leq \rho_0(\cdot) \leq \rho_+$ on \mathbb{T} . For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let μ_{le}^N be the measure on $\mathbb{T}_N \times \Sigma_N$ given by

$$\mu_{\rm le}^N(x,\xi) = \frac{\xi(x)}{\sum_{k\in\mathbb{T}_N}\rho_0(k/N)} \mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_0(\cdot)}(\xi), \quad \text{for } k\in\mathbb{T}_N .$$

$$(2.11)$$

Here, we define $\mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_0(\cdot)} = \mathscr{R}_N(\cdot; \{\tilde{\phi}_{k,N}\}) = \prod_{k \in \mathbb{T}_N} \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\phi}_{k,N}}$ where the parameters $\{\tilde{\phi}_{k,N}\}_{k \in \mathbb{T}_N}$ are such that $E_{\mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_0(\cdot)}}[\xi(k)] = \rho_0(k/N)$. We note when $\rho_0(\cdot) = \rho$ is constant, $\mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_0(\cdot)} = \mathscr{R}_{\rho}$.

Then, the marginals $\mu_{X,\text{le}}^N$ and $\mu_{L,\text{le}}^N$ are given by the following mass functions on \mathbb{T}_N and Σ_N respectively:

$$\mu_{X,\text{le}}^{N}(x) = \frac{\rho_{0}(x/N)}{\sum_{k \in \mathbb{T}_{N}} \rho_{0}(k/N)} \text{ and } \mu_{L,\text{le}}^{N}(\xi) = \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathbb{T}_{N}} \xi(k)}{\sum_{k \in \mathbb{T}_{N}} \rho_{0}(k/N)} \mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_{0}(\cdot)}(\xi).$$

One may verify that Condition 2.3 (a) for the size biased measure $\mu_{L,le}^N$ holds straightforwardly with respect to macroscopic profile ρ_0 as G is uniformly continuous by Chebychev and triangle inequalities. Similarly, Condition (2.3) (c), as $\mu_{X,\text{le}}^N$ converges weakly to $\rho_0(x)/\|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T})}dx$, holds also.

Also, Condition 2.3 (b) holds since

$$\mathscr{H}(\mu_{L,\mathrm{le}}^{N}|\mathscr{R}_{N}) = E_{\mathscr{R}_{N}} \Big[\log \frac{\sum_{k} \xi(k)}{\sum_{k} \rho_{0}(k/N)} \Big] + \mathscr{H}(\mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_{0}}(\cdot)|\mathscr{R}_{N}).$$

By Lemma 3.4 in [15] or straightforward computation, we observe that $\mathscr{H}(\mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_0(\cdot)}|\mathscr{R}_N) \leq CN$. Also, the first term is bounded by $E_{\mathscr{R}_N}\left[(\frac{1}{N}\sum_k \xi(k))/(\frac{1}{N}\sum_k \rho_0(k/N))\right] \leq C$ uniformly in N.

In addition, Condition 2.3 (e) holds : Note that the factors \mathcal{P}_{ϕ} are stochastically ordered in ϕ . Also, $\Phi(\rho_{-}) \leq \min_{k} \tilde{\phi}_{k,N} \leq \max_{k} \tilde{\phi}_{k,N} \leq \Phi(\rho_{+})$. Then, there are constants c_{0}, c_{1} such that $\max_{k \in \mathbb{T}_{N}} c_{0} \tilde{\phi}_{k,N} \leq \Phi(\rho_{-}) \leq \Phi(\rho_{+}) \leq \min_{k \in \mathbb{T}_{N}} c_{1} \tilde{\phi}_{k,N}$. For increasing coordinatewise functions $f: \Sigma_{N} \to \mathbb{R}$, we have $E_{\mathscr{R}_{N,c_{0}}}[f(\xi)] \leq E_{\mu_{L,b}}[f(\xi)] \leq E_{\mathscr{R}_{N,c_{1}}}[f(\xi)]$.

The next lemma asserts that Condition 2.3 (d) holds to complete the verification.

Proposition 2.4. There exists a constant $C(\rho_0) > 0$ depending only on ρ_0 such that $\mathscr{H}(\mu_{le}^N | \nu^N) \leq C(\rho_0)N$.

Proof. We calculate $\mathscr{H}(\mu_{le}^N | \nu^N) = E_{\mu_{le}^N} \left[\log \left(\frac{\mu_{le}^N(X,\xi)}{\nu^N(X,\xi)} \right) \right]$. Write, canceling the term in common $\xi(x)$,

$$\log \frac{\mu_{le}^N(x,\xi)}{\nu^N(x,\xi)} = \log \frac{\sum_{y \in \mathbb{T}_N} \rho_{y,N}}{\sum_{y \in \mathbb{T}_N} \rho_0(y/N)} + \log \frac{\mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_0(\cdot)}(\xi)}{\mathscr{R}_N(\xi)}.$$

Then,

$$\mathscr{H}(\mu_{le}^{N} \mid \nu^{N}) = \log \frac{\sum_{y \in \mathbb{T}_{N}} \rho_{x,N}(y)}{\sum_{y \in \mathbb{T}_{N}} \rho_{0}(y/N)} + E_{\mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_{0}}(\cdot)} \left[\frac{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_{N}} \xi(x)}{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_{N}} \rho_{0}(x/N)} \log \frac{\mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_{0}}(\cdot)(\xi)}{\mathscr{R}_{N}(\xi)} \right].$$
(2.12)

Since the densities are bounded uniformly, the first term is O(1). To treat the second term, write

$$\log \frac{\mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_0(\cdot)}(\xi)}{\mathscr{R}_N(\xi)} = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \log \frac{\mathscr{Z}(\phi_{x,N})}{\mathscr{Z}(\tilde{\phi}_{x,N})} + \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \xi(x) \log \frac{\tilde{\phi}_{x,N}}{\phi_{x,N}}.$$

Since the fugacities are bounded, the deterministic term on the right-hand side of the above display is O(N) and the other one is bounded by $C \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \xi(x)$. Then, the second term in (2.12) is bounded

by
$$O(N)E_{\mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_0}(\cdot)}\left[\frac{\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}_N}\xi(x)}{\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}_N}\rho_0(x/N)}\right] + CE_{\mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_0}(\cdot)}\left[\frac{\left(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}_N}\xi(x)\right)^2}{\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}_N}\rho_0(x/N)}\right]$$
, which is $O(N)$ as desired. \Box

Remark 2.5. We observe other 'local equilibrium measures' which locate the tagged particle at a fixed site $x_0 = x_0^N \in \mathbb{T}_N$ may also be considered. For instance, one may take $\mu_{\text{le}}^N(x_0,\xi) = (\mathbb{1}_{\{\xi(x_0)\geq 1\}}/E_{\mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_0}(\cdot)}[\mathbb{1}_{\{\xi(x_0)\geq 1\}}])\mathscr{R}_{N,\rho_0}(\cdot)(\xi)$ and $\mu_{\text{le}}^N(x,\xi) = 0$ for $x \neq x_0$, as opposed to (2.11), and verify that Condition 2.3 is satisfied. The sites $x_0 = x_0^N$ may be chosen so that $x_0^N/N \to z \in \mathbb{T}$.

2.7. Local particle number estimates via attractiveness. While the total particle number $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \eta_t(x) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \eta_0(x)$ for all $t \ge 0$ is conserved, and as the initial total number is O(N) by Condition 2.3 (e), such mass conservation does not provide control over local particle numbers $\eta_t(x)$ for a fixed $x \in \mathbb{T}_N$ that we will use in the sequel.

Lemma 2.6. Starting under an initial measure μ^N satisfying Condition 2.3 (e), the probability that the maximum number of particles $\max_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \eta_t(X_t^N + x)$ at any time $t \ge 0$ is larger than $\log N$ is small: For all C > 0, $\limsup_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{P}^N(\max_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \eta_t(X_t^N + x) \ge C \log N) = 0$.

Proof. We may rewrite, $\max_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \eta_t(X_t^N + x) = \max_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \eta_t(x)$, in terms of the system η_t , without the shift by X_t^N , which is attractive. Since $\max_x \eta_i(x)$ is an increasing function of η_i , we have by attractiveness and Condition 2.3 (e) that

$$\mathbb{P}_N\left[\max_x \eta_t(x) \ge C \log N\right] \le \mathbb{P}_{\mathscr{R}_{N,c_1}}\left[\max_x \eta_t(x) \ge C \log N\right].$$

Under the stationary measure \mathscr{R}_{N,c_1} , the variables $\{\eta_t(x)\}$ are independent with uniform over $x \in \mathbb{T}_N$ exponential moments due to the (FEM) condition (cf. Section 2.3) satisfied by the marginals $\mathcal{P}_{\phi_{x,N}}$, and that the fugacities $\phi_{x,N}$ are uniformly bounded in $x \in \mathbb{T}_N$. The claim follows as a consequence.

2.8. Hydrodynamics of the bulk density. Our main theorems for the evolution of X_t^N will involve the hydrodynamic bulk mass density of the system. We now apply results in [15] to identify this density. Consider the diffusively scaled particle mass empirical measure:

$$\pi_t^N(dx) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \eta_t(k) \delta_{k/N}(dx) \;,$$

where δ_x , stands for the Dirac mass at $x \in \mathbb{T}$. Let \mathcal{M}_+ be the space of finite nonnegative measures on \mathbb{T} , and observe that $\pi_t^N \in \mathscr{M}_+$. We will place a metric $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ on \mathscr{M}_+ which realizes the dual topology of $C(\mathbb{T})$ (see p. 49 of [13] for a definitive choice). Here, the trajectories $\{\pi_t^N : 0 \leq t \leq t\}$ T are elements of the Skorokhod space $D([0,T], \mathcal{M}_+)$, endowed with the associated Skorokhod topology.

In the following, for $G \in C(\mathbb{T})$ and $\pi \in \mathscr{M}_+$, denote $\langle G, \pi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}} G(u) \pi(du)$.

We now recall the hydrodynamic limit (HDL) for the process η . with respect to the environment α_{\cdot}^{N} in [15].

Theorem 2.7. For initial distributions μ_L^N , where μ^N satisfies Condition 2.3, for $t \in [0,T]$, test function $G \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{T})$, and $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_L^N} \left[\left| \langle G, \pi_t^N \rangle - \int_{\mathbb{T}} G(x) \rho(t, x) dx \right| > \delta \right] = 0,$$

where $\rho(t, x)$ is the unique weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho(t,x) = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{xx} \Phi(\rho(t,x)) - 2 \partial_x \left(\alpha(x) \Phi(\rho(t,x)) \right), \\ \rho(0,x) = \rho_0(x), \end{cases}$$
(2.13)

in the class of 'good' weak solutions given in Definition 2.8 below.

Definition 2.8. We say $\rho(t, x) : [0, T] \times \mathbb{T} \mapsto [0, \infty)$ is a good weak solution to (2.13) if

- (1) $\int_{\mathbb{T}} \rho(t, x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \rho_0(x) dx$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. (2) $\rho(t, \cdot)$ is weakly continuous, that is, for all $G \in C(\mathbb{T})$, $\int_{\mathbb{T}} G(x) \rho(t, x) dx$ is a continuous function in t.
- (3) There exists an $L^1([0,T] \times \mathbb{T})$ function denoted by $\partial_x \Phi(\rho(s,x))$ such that, for all $G(s,x) \in$ $C^{0,1}([0,T]\times\mathbb{T}), it holds$

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}} \partial_x G(s, x) \Phi(\rho(s, x)) dx ds = -\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}} G(s, x) \partial_x \Phi(\rho(s, x)) dx ds.$$

(4) For all $G(s,x) \in C^{\infty}_{c}([0,T] \times \mathbb{T})$

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}} \partial_s G(s,x)\rho(s,x)dxds + \int_{\mathbb{T}} G(0,x)\rho_0(x)dx$$
$$= -\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left[\frac{1}{2}\partial_{xx}G(s,x)\Phi(\rho(s,x)) + \partial_x G(s,x)[\alpha(x)\Phi(\rho(s,x))]\right]dxds.$$

Remark 2.9. We comment that the proof of Proposition 9.2 in [15] yields, exactly in the way the proof of Theorem V.7.1 in [13] does in the translation-invariant setting when $\alpha_{\cdot}^{N} \equiv 0$, the additional bound $\int_{0}^{T} ds \int_{\mathbb{T}} du \frac{|\partial_{x} \Phi(\rho(s, u))|^{2}}{\Phi(\rho(s, u))} < \infty$, although we don't use it in this article.

As a consequence of Theorem 2.7, we observe that both quenched and annealed hydrodynamic limits follow with respect to random environment $\left\{ r_k^N := \frac{1}{\sigma N \varepsilon} \sum_{|j-k| \leq \lfloor N \varepsilon \rfloor} r_j \psi\left(\frac{j-k}{\varepsilon}\right) : k \in \mathbb{T}_N \right\}$ (cf. Section 2.2).

Let $E_P \mathbb{P}_N^{\omega}$ be the annealed probability measure, where $P(d\omega)$ governs the random environment $\omega = \{r_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_N^{\omega} = \mathbb{P}_N$ is the process measure of the speeded up zero-range process η , with single particle jump rates $(1/2) \pm r_k^N / \sqrt{N}$ to the left and right from location $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$, conditioned on the environment. Recall that $\{q_k^N\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{r_k^N\}$ and that a.s. $\sqrt{N}q_k^N \to W_{\varepsilon}'(x)$ when $k/N \to x$ (cf. (2.4), (2.5)).

Theorem 2.10. With respect to the random environments, we have the hydrodynamic limits:

(I) (Quenched HDL) For almost all realizations ω , the statement of Theorem 2.7 holds with respect to $\alpha_{\cdot}^{N} = \sqrt{N}q_{\cdot}^{N}$ and $\alpha = W'_{\varepsilon}$.

(II) (Annealed HDL) Moreover, the law of π^N_{\cdot} , under $E_P \mathbb{P}^{\omega}_N$, converges weakly to the law of $\rho(\cdot, x) dx = \rho(\cdot, x; \Phi, W'_{\varepsilon}) dx$ with respect to the distribution of Brownian motion W.

2.9. Boundedness and regularity of the good weak solution ρ . It will be useful to specify an a priori bound of $\rho(t, x)$, the good weak solution of (2.13), as well as its regularity depending on the smoothness of α . Define, for $\ell \geq 1$,

$$\eta^{\ell}(x) := \frac{1}{2\ell + 1} \sum_{|k-x| \le \ell} \eta(k).$$
(2.14)

Then, $\eta_t^{\theta N}(\lfloor uN \rfloor) = \frac{2\theta N}{2\theta N+1} \left\langle \frac{1}{2\theta} \mathbb{1}_{\left[-\theta + \frac{1}{N} \lfloor uN \rfloor, \theta + \frac{1}{N} \lfloor uN \rfloor\right]}, \ \pi_t^N \right\rangle$, for $\theta > 0$.

Lemma 2.11. With initial measure μ^N satisfying Condition 2.3, the following holds.

1. There exists positive constants ρ_{-}, ρ^{+} such that the solution to (2.13) satisfies $\rho_{-} \leq \rho(t,x) \leq \rho^{+}$ for a.e $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{T}$. As a consequence, $b_{0} \leq \Phi'(\rho(t,x)), \frac{\Phi(\rho(t,x))}{\rho(t,x)} \leq b_{1}$ for $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{T}$, for $0 < b_{0} \leq b_{1} < \infty$.

2. (a) Suppose that $\alpha \in C(\mathbb{T})$ and $\rho_0 \in C^{\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta > 0$. Then, we have $\rho(t,x) \in C^{\gamma/2,\gamma}([0,T] \times \mathbb{T})$ for a $0 < \gamma \leq \beta$.

(b) Now suppose that $\alpha \in C^{\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ and $\rho_0 \in C^{1+\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta > 0$. Let $u(t,x) = \int_0^x \rho(t,z)dz$ on $[0,T] \times \mathbb{T}$. Then, $u(t,x) \in C^{(2+\gamma)/2,2+\gamma}([0,T] \times \mathbb{T})$, for a $0 < \gamma \leq \beta$, is a classical solution of

$$\partial_t u(t,x) = \frac{1}{2} \Phi'(\nabla u) \Delta u - 2\alpha(x) \Phi(\nabla u), \qquad (2.15)$$

and as a consequence the unique para-controlled solution of (2.15), certainly belonging to space $\mathscr{L}_T^{3/2-} = C([0,T], \hat{C}^{3/2-}(\mathbb{T})) \cap C^{(3/2-)/2}([0,T], L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T})).$

Consequently, $\rho(t, x) = \nabla u(t, x) \in C^{(2+\gamma)/2, 1+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}).$

Here, $\hat{C}^{\beta}(\mathbb{T}) := B^{\beta}_{\infty,\infty}(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{R})$ is the spatial Hölder-Besov space equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\hat{C}^{\beta}}$; see page 62, Appendix A.1 in [8] for the exact definition. When $\beta \in (0,\infty) \setminus \mathbb{N}$, it is known that $\hat{C}^{\beta}(\mathbb{T}) = C^{\beta}(\mathbb{T})$, the standard Hölder space used in [14] and [17], and also $C^{\beta}(\mathbb{T}) \subset \hat{C}^{\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ when $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$; see page 62 in [8] and page 99 in [2].

Then, $C_T \hat{C}^{\beta} := C([0,T], \hat{C}^{\beta}(\mathbb{T}))$ is the space of \hat{C}^{β} -valued continuous functions on [0,T] with the supremum norm $\|f\|_{C_T \hat{C}^{\beta}} = \sup_{0 \le t \le T} \|f(t)\|_{\hat{C}^{\beta}}$, and $C_T^{\beta/2} L^{\infty} := C^{\beta/2}([0,T], L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}))$ is the space of $\beta/2$ -Hölder continuous functions from [0,T] to $L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T})$ with the semi-norm $\|f\|_{C_T^{\beta/2} L^{\infty}} =$ $\sup_{0 \le s \ne t \le T} \|f(t) - f(s)\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T})}/|t - s|^{\beta/2}$. The norm on \mathscr{L}_T^{β} is $\|f\|_{\mathscr{L}_T^{\beta}} = \|f\|_{C_T \hat{C}^{\beta}} + \|f\|_{C_T^{\beta/2} L^{\infty}}$. Proof of Lemma 2.11. Let S_t^N be the semigroup associated to L, generating the standard process (2.1). By assumption (A) and Condition 2.3 (e), for the attractive system, we have the stochastic ordering

$$\mathscr{R}_{\rho_{-}} \ll \mathscr{R}_{N,c_0} \le \mu_L^N S_t^N \le \mathscr{R}_{N,c_1} \ll \mathscr{R}_{\rho_{+}}.$$
(2.16)

Then, $E_{\mathscr{R}_{\rho_{-}}}[f] \leq E_{\mu_{L}^{N}S_{t}^{N}}[f] \leq E_{\mathscr{R}_{\rho_{+}}}[f]$ for any monotone function f on $\mathbb{N}_{0}^{\mathbb{T}_{N}}$.

Set $f(\eta) = \eta^{\theta N}(\lfloor Nu \rfloor)$. The hydrodynamic limit (Theorem 2.7) gives that $\rho_{-} \leq \frac{1}{2\theta} \int_{-\theta}^{\theta} \rho(t, u+v) dv \leq \rho_{+}$. Hence, $\rho_{-} \leq \rho(t, u) \leq \rho_{+}$ a.e. with respect to Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} as desired. The bounds on $\Phi'(\rho) = \Phi(\rho)/\sigma^{2}(\rho)$ (cf. after (2.7)) and $\Phi(\rho)/\rho$ follow as Φ is strictly increasing, and $\Phi(\rho) > 0$ and $\sigma^{2}(\rho) > 0$ for $\rho > 0$.

One may deduce Part 2 (a), as $\rho(t, x)$ is bounded by Part 1, and as $\alpha(x)$ and $\Phi(\rho)$ are bounded by assumption and Part 1 again, by the regularity Theorem VI.6.33 in [17] for weak solutions.

For Part 2 (b), that u is a classical solution now follows via Theorem V.5.14 in [17] as $\Phi'(\rho), \alpha \Phi(\rho)$, thought of as functions of (t, x), are bounded and belong to $C^{\gamma/2,\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathbb{T})$ for a $0 < \gamma \leq \beta$ by Part 1 and Part 2 (a). [We note in passing that Theorems 6.1 and 6.4 in [14] are used in Section 2.1, pages 866-867 in [5] to deduce regularity of $\rho(t, x)$ under stronger assumptions on $\alpha(=\xi \in C^2(\mathbb{T})$ in the notation there) and $\rho_0 \in C^{2+\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta \in (0, 1)$.]

Moreover, as u is a classical solution of (2.15), we claim it is the unique para-controlled solution in $\mathscr{L}_T^{3/2-}$. Indeed, the assumptions on $\xi = \alpha \in C^{\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ (in the notation of [6], [5]) and $\rho_0 \in C^{1+\beta}(\mathbb{T})$, since $\beta > 0 > -1/2-$ and $1+\beta > 1/2-$, satisfy the conditions in [6], [5] for u to be in \mathscr{L}_T^{γ} for all $\gamma \in (13/9, 3/2)$. Since u is classical, all terms in (2.15) are well-defined as continuous functions and (2.15) coincides with the fixed-point problem definition of the unique local-in-time para-controlled solution in Section 2 in [6], extended to global-in-time in [5].

Remark 2.12. We note the question of whether u(t, x), corresponding to a good weak solution $\rho(t, x)$ without further assumptions, is the unique para-controlled solution of (2.15) in a space \mathscr{L}_T^{γ} is of interest and left for future investigation. Part of the reason for the choice in Part 2(b) of Lemma 2.11, and later in Theorems 2.13 and 3.4 to choose $\rho_0 \in C^{1+\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ and $\alpha \in C^{\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta > 0$, or $\alpha = W_{\varepsilon}' \in C^{1/2-}(\mathbb{T})$ is that u(t, x) is guaranteed to be the para-controlled solution of (2.15).

2.10. Singular hydrodynamic limit as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. When $\alpha = W'_{\varepsilon}$, we now discuss the limit of $\rho = \rho^{\varepsilon}$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, which follows from [6], [5].

For the following result, we will specify enough smoothness of ρ_0 (the same initial condition for all ρ^{ε}) to fit into the framework of Part 2(b) of Lemma 2.11. Recall also that Φ is $C^{\infty}([0,\infty))$ and by (LG), (M) that $g_* \leq \Phi(\rho)/\rho \leq g^*$, which allow us to fit into the framework of [6], [5].

Theorem 2.13. Fix $\rho_0 \in C^{1+\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta > 0$. With respect to $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\alpha = W'_{\varepsilon} \in C^{1/2-}(\mathbb{T})$ as in (2.6), the solutions ρ^{ε} of (2.13) with initial condition ρ_0 converge in probability, with respect to the probability measure \mathbb{P}_W governing W, to the solution ρ^0 of the SPDE

$$\partial_t \rho^0 = \frac{1}{2} \Delta \left(\Phi(\rho^0) \right) - 2\nabla \left(W' \Phi(\rho^0) \right)$$

in the space $\mathscr{L}_T^{1/2-}$, which is the gradient $\rho^0 = \nabla u^0$ with respect to the unique para-controlled solution of $\partial_t u^0 = \frac{1}{2} \Phi'(\nabla u^0) \Delta u^0 - W' \Phi(\nabla u^0)$.

In particular, $\rho^{\varepsilon}(t,x)$ converges uniformly to $\rho^{0}(t,x)$ for $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{T}$, in probability with respect to \mathbb{P}_{W} .

Proof. We give the relevant citations. By Part 2(b) of Lemma 2.11, ρ^{ε} is the gradient of the unique para-controlled solution of (2.15). Then, Theorem 2.13 follows by Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.3 and Remark 1.2 in [5], noting the noise $W'_{\varepsilon} \in C^{2-\gamma}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\gamma \in (13/9, 3/2)$ and $\rho_0 \in C^{1+\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ and $1 + \beta > 1/2$ thereby satisfying the assumptions in [5], which shows existence/uniqueness of the para-controlled solution ρ^0 global-in-time, extending the local-in-time convergence shown in probability, Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 5.2 in [6], to all times.

3. Results

To state results for a tagged particle, we recall the interpretation of a diffusion x_t on a torus as one 'unwrapped' on \mathbb{R} with periodic coefficients. Let $\hat{x}_t = \hat{x}_t^z$ be an Itô diffusion on \mathbb{R} satisfying with respect to a probability space with admissible filtration the SDE

$$d\hat{x}_t = b(t, \hat{x}_t) dt + \sigma(t, \hat{x}_t) dB_t , \qquad \hat{x}_0 = z,$$
(3.1)

for $z \in \mathbb{R}$. When the functions $b(t, \cdot)$ and $\sigma(t, \cdot)$ are periodic with period 1 for all $t \in [0, T]$, we may write

$$\hat{x}_t - z = \int_0^t b(s, \hat{x}_s - \lfloor \hat{x}_s \rfloor) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, \hat{x}_s - \lfloor \hat{x}_s \rfloor) dB_s.$$

We may understand the diffusion $x_t = x_t^Z$ on the torus $\mathbb{T} = (0, 1]$ (with the usual distance $d(a, b) = \min\{|a - b|, 1 - |a - b|\}$), satisfying

$$dx_t = b(t, x_t)dt + \sigma(t, x_t)dB_t, \qquad x_0 \stackrel{d}{=} Z$$

for $t \ge 0$, where Z is a random variable, via the mixture relation $x_t = \hat{x}_t^Z - \lfloor \hat{x}_t^Z \rfloor \in \mathbb{T}$, with z = Z, whose process measure is $E_Z[\hat{\mathscr{P}}^z] = \int \hat{\mathscr{P}}^z dP(Z \in dz)$, where $\hat{\mathscr{P}}^z$ is the process measure of \hat{x}_t^z .

If there is a unique weak solution \hat{x}^z for each $z \in \mathbb{R}$, then the process measure of \hat{x}_t^Z is uniquely given as $E_Z[\hat{\mathscr{P}}^z]$ (cf. Proposition 1 and remark following in [11]). Correspondingly, in this situation,

the process measure of
$$x_t^Z$$
 is $E_Z[\mathscr{P}^z]$ (3.2)

where \mathscr{P}^z is the process measure of $\hat{x}_t^z - \lfloor \hat{x}_t^z \rfloor$ for a fixed z.

Our first main result identifies a diffusion limit for $\frac{1}{N}X_t^N = \frac{1}{N}X_{N^2t}$ with respect to an α_{\cdot}^N environment, when the initial condition has some smoothness to guarantee smoothness of $\rho(t, x)$ (cf. Lemma 2.11).

Theorem 3.1. Suppose $\alpha \in C(\mathbb{T})$ and $\rho_0 \in C^{\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta > 0$. Let the initial measures μ^N of the process (X_t^N, η_t) satisfy Condition 2.3. Then, $\frac{1}{N}X_t^N$ for $t \in [0, T]$ converges in distribution in the uniform topology to a diffusion x_t on \mathbb{T} given by the unique weak solution of the SDE

$$dx_t = 2 \frac{\Phi(\rho(t, x_t))}{\rho(t, x_t)} \,\alpha(x_t) \,dt + \sqrt{\frac{\Phi(\rho(t, x_t))}{\rho(t, x_t)}} \,dB_t \ , \ x_0 \stackrel{d}{=} Z_X, \tag{3.3}$$

whose process measure is given by (3.2), where B is a standard Brownian motion, $\rho(t, u)$ is the hydrodynamic density specified in (2.13), and Z_X is the limit in distribution of $\frac{1}{N}X_0^N$.

Remark 3.2. We comment, with more smoothness, say $\alpha(\cdot) \in C^{\beta'}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta' \geq 1$ (and therefore Lipschitz) and $\rho_0 \in C^{1+\beta''}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta'' > 0$, we have $\rho(t, u) \in C^{(2+\gamma)/2, 1+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathbb{T})$ for a $0 < \gamma \leq \min\{\beta', \beta''\}$ by Part 2 (b) of Lemma 2.11. Then, the SDE above would have bounded, Lipschitz coefficients, and x_t would be the unique pathwise solution of (3.3), implying strong existence by the Yamada-Watanabe theorem (cf. Theorem IX.1.7 in [19]).

Next, as a consequence, we state quenched and annealed results. Recall the quenched random environment formulation in Section 2.2.

Corollary 3.3. Consider the setting of Theorem 3.1 where $\rho_0 \in C^{\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta > 0$ and now $\alpha = W_{\varepsilon}' \in C^{1/2-}(\mathbb{T})$ as in (2.6) with respect to $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, under a quenched random environment ω , we have $\frac{1}{N}X_t^N$ for $t \in [0,T]$ converges in distribution in the uniform topology to the unique weak solution $x_t^{\varepsilon} = x_t$ on \mathbb{T} satisfying

$$dx_t = 2 \frac{\Phi(\rho(t, x_t))}{\rho(t, x_t)} W_{\varepsilon}'(x_t) dt + \sqrt{\frac{\Phi(\rho(t, x_t))}{\rho(t, x_t)}} dB_t, \qquad x_0 \sim Z_X,$$
(3.4)

where $\rho = \rho^{\varepsilon}$ is the hydrodynamic density specified in Theorem 2.10 with initial condition ρ_0 .

Moreover, under the annealed measure $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_W}\mathbb{P}^N$, the law of $\frac{1}{N}X_t^N$ converges weakly to the law of x_t^{ε} under \mathbb{P}_W , the law of W.

Proof. The quenched part follows from Theorem 3.1. The annealed result follows straightforwardly from the quenched one: If $\mathbb{E}^{N}[F(\frac{1}{N}X_{\cdot}^{N})] \to E[F(x_{\cdot}^{\varepsilon})]$ for bounded, continuous $F: D([0,1],\mathbb{T}) \to \mathbb{R}$, then $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_{W}}\mathbb{E}^{N}[F(\frac{1}{N}X_{\cdot}^{N})] \to \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_{W}}E[F(x_{\cdot}^{\varepsilon})]$, by bounded convergence.

We now consider the limit of the diffusions x_t^{ε} as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Consider the diffusion $\hat{x}_t^0 = \hat{x}_t^{0,z}$ on \mathbb{R} , formally given with periodic drift and diffusion coefficient by

$$d\hat{x}_t^0 = 2\frac{\Phi(\rho^0(t, \hat{x}_t^0))}{\rho^0(t, \hat{x}_t^0)} W'(\hat{x}_t^0) dt + \sqrt{\frac{\Phi(\rho^0(t, \hat{x}_t^0))}{\rho^0(t, \hat{x}_t^0)}} dB_t^0, \qquad \hat{x}_0^0 = z$$

where $z \in \mathbb{R}$. More carefully, as with Brox diffusion, we specify it in terms of scale: Namely, for $t \ge 0$, define $\hat{x}_t^0 = s_0^{-1} \left(s_0(z) + B^0(T_0^{-1}(t)) \right)$ on \mathbb{R} where

$$s_{0}(x) := \int_{0}^{x} \exp\left(-4\left\{\lfloor y \rfloor W(1) + W(y - \lfloor y \rfloor)\right\}\right) dy$$

$$T_{0}(t) := \int_{0}^{t} \exp\left(8\left\{\lfloor s_{0}^{-1}(s_{0}(z) + B_{r}^{0}) \rfloor W(1) + W\left(s_{0}^{-1}(s_{0}(z) + B_{r}^{0}) - \lfloor s_{0}^{-1}(s_{0}(z) + B_{r}^{0}) \rfloor\right)\right\}\right)$$

$$\times \frac{1}{\chi_{0}(t, s_{0}^{-1}(s_{0}(z) + B_{r}^{0}))} dr.$$
(3.5)

Here, B^0 is a standard Brownian motion and $\chi_0(t, x) = \Phi(\rho^0(t, x))/\rho^0(t, x)$.

We now impose a bit more smoothness on ρ_0 to guarantee that u(t, x) solving (2.15) with $\alpha = W'_{\varepsilon}$ is a classical solution and therefore a para-controlled solution, so as to access the paracontrolled limits in [6], [5].

Theorem 3.4. Consider the setting of Corollary 3.3. Let now $\rho_0 \in C^{1+\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ where $\beta > 0$. Let also $x_0^0 \stackrel{d}{=} Z_X$. Define the process x_t^0 for $t \in [0,T]$ on \mathbb{T} as a mixture $x_t^0 = \hat{x}_t^{0,Z_X} - \lfloor \hat{x}_t^{0,Z_X} \rfloor$, where $z = Z_X$. We have that the diffusions x_t^{ε} on \mathbb{T} , specified in (3.4), converge in distribution to x_t^0 as $\varepsilon \to 0$ in \mathbb{P}_W -probability.

Moreover, as a consequence, the laws of x_t^{ε} under the annealed measure \mathbb{P}_W converge in distribution to the law of x_t^0 under \mathbb{P}_W as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

We will prove the quenched part of Theorem 3.4 in Section 5. The annealed statement follows as a consequence as in the proof of Corollary 3.3.

Remark 3.5. We comment, with respect to a Brownian-bridge environment (see after (2.6)), where the disorder $a_k^N = \alpha_k^N - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{T}_N} \alpha_j^N$ and $a(u) = W'_{\varepsilon}(u) - \int_{\mathbb{T}} W'_{\varepsilon}(v) dv$ has the same smoothness as $\alpha(u) = W'_{\varepsilon}$, one may deduce the corresponding version of Corollary 3.3 from Theorem 3.1, with $a(\cdot)$ in place of $\alpha(\cdot)$.

Also, the corresponding version of singular hydrodynamic limit Theorem 2.13, in terms of para-controlled solution $\rho^{a,0}(t,x)$, holds with respect to $a(\cdot)$ and formal limit $W'(\cdot) - W(1)$ in place of $\alpha(\cdot)$ and W'. Then, a corresponding singular diffusion limit Theorem 3.4 holds with $s_{a,0}$, $T_{a,0}$ and $\rho^{a,0}$ in place of s_0 , T_0 and ρ^0 where

$$\begin{split} s_{a,0}(x) &:= \int_0^x \exp\left(-4W(y - \lfloor y \rfloor) + 4W(1)(y - \lfloor y \rfloor)\right) dy \\ T_{a,0}(t) &:= \int_0^t \exp\left(8W(s_{a,0}^{-1}(s_{a,0}(z) + B_r^0) - \lfloor s_{a,0}^{-1}(s_{a,0}(z) + B_r^0) \rfloor) \\ &- 8W(1)(s_{a,0}^{-1}(s_{a,0}(z) + B_r^0) - \lfloor s_{a,0}^{-1}(s_{a,0}(z) + B_r^0) \rfloor)\right) \frac{1}{\chi_0(t, s_{a,0}^{-1}(s_{a,0}(z) + B_r^0))} dr. \end{split}$$

4. Proof of Theorem 3.1: Diffusion limit in an $\alpha(\cdot)$ environment

We develop a martingale representation for X_t^N , discuss homogenization via a Replacement Lemma 4.1, and associated tightness of terms in the representation in the following subsections, before proving Theorem 3.1 in Section 4.4.

4.1. Martingale representation. Let J_t^- (respectively J_t^+) be the total number of jumps up to time t by the tagged particle X_t^N to the left (respectively right). Such a process is a function of (X_t^N, η_t) . We may express the tagged particle location as $X_0^N + J_t^+ - J_t^-$ modulo N. These counting processes J_t^{\pm} are compensated in terms of the jump rates $N^2 \frac{g(\eta_t(X_t^N))}{\eta(X_t)} p_{X_t^N}^{N,\pm}$ so that

$$M_t^{\pm} = J_t^{\pm} - N^2 \int_0^t \frac{g(\eta_s(X_s^N))}{\eta_s(X_s^N)} \, p_{X_s^N}^{N,\pm} \, ds$$

are martingales. One may also compute the quadratic variations, noting that the size of the jumps are $1 = |\pm 1|$, as

$$\langle M^{\pm} \rangle_t = N^2 \int_0^t \frac{g(\eta_s(X_s^N))}{\eta_s(X_s^N)} \, p_{X_s^N}^{N,\pm} \, ds.$$

Since the jumps are not simultaneous, the martingales M_t^+ and M_t^- are orthogonal, and therefore their cross variation vanishes.

Since $p_{X_s^N}^{N,+} - p_{X_s^N}^{N,-} = \frac{2}{N} \alpha_{X_s^N}^N$, we obtain a representation for X_t^N :

$$\frac{1}{N}X_t^N - \frac{1}{N}X_0^N = 2\int_0^t \frac{g(\eta_s^N(X_s^N))}{\eta_s^N(X_s^N)} \,\alpha_{X_s^N}^N \,ds + \frac{1}{N}M_t^N,\tag{4.1}$$

modulo 1 (actually supported on $\frac{1}{N}\mathbb{T}_N$), where $M_t^N = M_t^+ - M_t^-$. Alternatively, one can extend X_{\cdot}^N periodically to \mathbb{Z} , in which case (4.1) would be an equation on \mathbb{R} say.

The quadratic variation of $\frac{1}{N}M_t^N$, adding the quadratic variations of $\frac{1}{N}M^{\pm}$, equals

$$\frac{1}{N^2} \langle M^N \rangle_t = \int_0^t \frac{g(\eta_s^N(X_s^N))}{\eta_s^N(X_s^N)} \, ds.$$
(4.2)

4.2. Homogenization of rates. To take limits in the martingale representation (4.1), we would like to replace the local rate $g(\eta_t(X_t^N))/\eta_t(X_t^N)$ by its appropriate continuum homogenization. Since $\frac{g(n)}{n}$ is bounded and Lipschitz by our assumptions on g (Section 2.1), we state a 'replacement' Lemma 4.1 with respect to a bounded, Lipschitz function h evaluated at coordinate $\eta_{\cdot}(X_{\cdot}^N)$.

As mentioned in the introduction, we will replace $h(\eta_t(X_t^N))$ by its average with respect to a localized 'equilibrium' distribution. We will be able to show effects of the random environment are minimal in this localization. At time $N^2 t$, the system has settled so that near the location X_t^N one expects the local configuration $\eta_t(X_t^N + x)$ for $1 \le x \le \epsilon N$ to be distributed by a stationary distribution \mathscr{R} . for the translation-invariant system indexed by the local random density $\eta_t^{\theta N}(X_t^N + x)$ (cf. (2.14)).

This is formulated as the following result.

Lemma 4.1 (The Replacement Lemma). Let h be a bounded and Lipschitz function. Let also D_x^N be a bounded function of $x \in \mathbb{T}_N$, uniformly for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\limsup_{\ell \to \infty} \limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{\theta \to 0} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^{N} \left[\left| \int_{0}^{t} D_{X_{s}^{N}}^{N} \left(h(\eta_{s}(X_{s}^{N})) - \frac{1}{\epsilon N} \sum_{x=1}^{\epsilon N} \overline{H_{\ell}}(\eta_{s}^{\theta N}(X_{s}^{N} + x)) \right) ds \right| \right] = 0$$

$$(4.3)$$

where

(1)
$$H(\rho) = E_{\nu_{\rho}^{0}}[h(\xi(0))]$$
 with $\nu_{\rho}^{0} = \frac{\xi(0)}{\rho} \mathscr{R}_{\rho}(\xi)$

(2)
$$\overline{H_{\ell}}(\rho) = E_{\mathscr{R}_{\rho}}[H(\eta^{\ell}(0))]$$
 and \mathscr{R}_{ρ} is defined in Section 2.4

Proof. The proof is divided into several steps. Each step will be dealt with in its own later section. These steps are: local 1-block in Section 6.1, local 2-block in Section 6.2, and global replacement in Section 6.3. By the triangle inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{N} \left[\left| \int_{0}^{t} D_{X_{s}^{N}}^{N} \left(h(\eta_{s}(X_{s}^{N})) - \frac{1}{\epsilon N} \sum_{x=1}^{\epsilon N} \overline{H_{\ell}}(\eta_{s}^{\theta N}(X_{s}^{N} + x)) \right) ds \right| \right]$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}^{N} \left[\left| \int_{0}^{t} D_{X_{s}^{N}}^{N} \left(h(\eta_{s}(X_{s}^{N})) - H(\eta_{s}^{\ell}(X_{s}^{N})) \right) ds \right| \right]$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}^{N} \left[\left| \int_{0}^{t} D_{X_{s}^{N}}^{N} \left(H(\eta_{s}^{\ell}(X_{s}^{N})) - \frac{1}{\epsilon N} \sum_{x=1}^{\epsilon N} H(\eta_{s}^{\ell}(X_{s}^{N} + x)) \right) ds \right| \right]$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}^{N} \left[\left| \int_{0}^{t} D_{X_{s}^{N}}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon N} \sum_{x=1}^{\epsilon N} H(\eta_{s}^{\ell}(X_{s}^{N} + x)) - \frac{1}{\epsilon N} \sum_{x=1}^{\epsilon N} \overline{H_{\ell}}(\eta_{s}^{\theta N}(X_{s}^{N} + x)) \right) ds \right| \right].$$

$$(4.4)$$

As h is bounded, Lipschitz, it is known that H is bounded, Lipschitz; see Lemma 6.7 in [9]. Then, each term on the right of (4.4) vanishes in the limit by Lemmas 6.3, 6.6, and 6.7 respectively.

4.3. Tightness of constituent processes. We now state that the processes

$$\mathscr{X}_N = (\pi^N_{\cdot}, \tau_{X_{\cdot}^N} \pi^N_{\cdot}, \frac{1}{N} X^N_{\cdot}, \frac{1}{N} M^N_{\cdot}, \langle \frac{1}{N} M^N \rangle_{\cdot})$$

are tight in the associated Skorohod space $\mathscr{D}([0,T]) = \mathscr{D}([0,T], \mathscr{M}_{+}(\mathbb{T}) \times \mathscr{M}_{+}(\mathbb{T}) \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ endowed with the Skorohod topology. In fact, we will show that \mathscr{X}_{N} is tight with respect to the uniform topology, associated with $\mathscr{C}([0,T]) = \mathscr{C}([0,T], \mathscr{M}_{+}(\mathbb{T}) \times \mathscr{M}_{+}(\mathbb{T}) \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$. Here, τ_{x} is the shift operator so that

$$\tau_x \pi^N_{\cdot} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{T}_N} \eta_{\cdot} (z+x) \delta_{z/N}.$$

Theorem 4.2. The sequence Q^N of distributions of \mathscr{X}_N , belonging to $\mathscr{D}([0,T])$, is tight with respect to the uniform topology of $\mathscr{C}([0,T])$.

Proof. Let $A_t^N = \int_0^t \frac{g(\eta_s(X_s^N))}{\eta_s(X_s^N)} ds$ and $C_t^N = \int_0^t \frac{g(\eta_s(X_s^N))}{\eta_s(X_s^N)} \alpha_{X_s^N}^N ds$ so that $\frac{1}{N}(X_t^N - X_0^N) = \frac{1}{N}M_t^N + C_t^N$, modulo 1, in (4.1). Since $g(n) \leq g^*n$ by assumption (LG), and $\sup_N \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} |\alpha_x^N| < \infty$, we have the processes A_{\cdot}^N and C_{\cdot}^N are tight with respect to the uniform topology by Kolmogorov-Centsov criterion. Since $\langle \frac{1}{N}M^N \rangle_{\cdot} = A_{\cdot}^N$ (cf. (4.2)), we have also that $\langle \frac{1}{N}M^N \rangle_{\cdot}$ is tight.

Since $\frac{1}{N}X_0^N$ is assumed to converge weakly to Z_X , the initial value is therefore tight. The same argument as in Lemma 3.3 in [9] shows that $\frac{1}{N}X_{\cdot}^N$ is tight in the uniform topology. Indeed, the jump rate of X^N is $g(\eta(X^N))/\eta(X^N) \leq g^*$, and so one can couple X_{\cdot}^N with Z_{\cdot}^N a random walk with rate g^* on \mathbb{T}_N with the same skeleton but holding times less than or equal to those of X_{\cdot}^N . Then, $\frac{1}{N} \sup_{|t-s| \leq \theta} |X_t^N - X_s^N| \leq \frac{1}{N} \sup_{|t-s| \leq \theta} |Z_t^N - Z_s^N|$. Tightness then follows by that of scaled simple symmetric random walk on \mathbb{T}_N .

Moreover, by Aldous criterion, as

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \sup_{\tau} \sup_{\theta \leq \gamma} \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E}^N[|M_{\tau+\theta}^N - M_{\tau}^N|^2] = \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \sup_{\tau} \sup_{\theta \leq \gamma} \mathbb{E}^N\Big[\int_{\tau}^{\tau+\theta} \frac{g(\eta_r(X_r^N)}{\eta_r(X_r^N)} dr\Big] \leq \limsup_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \sup_{\theta \leq \gamma} g^*\theta = 0,$$

we conclude that $\frac{1}{N}M^N_{\cdot}$ is tight in the Skorohod topology. Since $\frac{1}{N}X^N_t - \frac{1}{N}X^N_0 - C^N_t = \frac{1}{N}M^N_t$ (cf. (4.1)), any limit point (x, m, C) of $(\frac{1}{N}X^N_{\cdot}, \frac{1}{N}M^N_{\cdot}, A^N_{\cdot})$ is such that $x_t - x_0 - C_t = m_t$. Since x and C are supported on continuous paths by the tightness shown in the uniform topology, we

conclude m. is also supported on continuous paths, and therefore $\frac{1}{N}M^N$ is tight in the uniform topology.

The empirical measure π^N is also tight in the uniform topology as shown in Section 8 in [15] with respect to the hydrodynamic limit Theorem 2.7 shown there.

Finally, by Mitôma's criterion, to show $\tau_{X_t^N} \pi_t^N$ is tight, it is sufficient to show $\langle G, \tau_{X_t^N} \pi_t^N \rangle$ is tight for each continuous, compactly supported function G. Write

$$\langle G, \tau_{X_t^N} \pi_t^N \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \eta_t(x + X_t^N) G(\frac{x}{N}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \eta_t(x) G(\frac{x - X_t^N}{N}) = \langle \tau_{-\frac{1}{N} X_t^N} G, \pi_t^N \rangle.$$

Since $t \mapsto \langle \tau_{-x_t} G, \pi_t \rangle$ is a continuous function of (x, π) and $(\frac{1}{N} X^N, \pi^N)$ is tight with respect to the uniform topology, we have that $\tau_{X^N} \pi^N$ is also tight in the uniform topology.

4.4. Identification of limit points and proof of Theorem 3.1. We now describe the limit points of Q_N , in which the fourth item is the statement of Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 4.3. Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.1, Q_N converges with respect to the uniform topology to the law Q concentrated on trajectories $\mathscr{X} = (\pi_{\cdot}, \tau_x, \pi_{\cdot}, x_{\cdot}, m_{\cdot}, A_{\cdot})$ such that

π_t(du) = ρ(t, u) du where ρ is the unique weak solution to (2.13).
 τ_{xt}π_t(du) = ρ(t, x_t + u) du.
 A_t = ∫₀^t Φ(ρ(s, x_s)) / ρ(s, x_s) ds.
 x_t is the unique weak solution for (3.3) with x₀ ^d = Z_X, governed by the process measure (3.2).

Proof. By Theorem 4.2, we have tightness of \mathscr{X}_N with respect to the uniform topology. So we may take a subsequence $\{N_k\}$ such that \mathscr{X}_{N_k} converges in distribution to \mathscr{X} supported on continuous paths on [0, T]. To reduce notation, let us assume that \mathscr{X}_N converges in distribution to \mathscr{X} whose law is Q. Now, we will prove items #1 - #4.

Claim #1. The first item is the hydrodynamics result Theorem 2.7 (cf. Theorem 3.3 in [15]).

Claim #2. For the 2nd item, note as in the proof of Theorem 4.2 for any $G \in C(\mathbb{T})$, we have $\langle G, \tau_{X_t^N} \pi_t^N \rangle = \langle \tau_{(-\frac{1}{N}X_t^N)} G, \pi_t^N \rangle$. The right hand side $\langle \tau_{-\frac{1}{N}X_t^N} G, \pi_t^N \rangle$ is a continuous function of $(\frac{1}{N}X^N, \pi^N)$ which converges to $\langle \tau_{-x}, G, \pi_\cdot \rangle$. To identify the limiting distribution, it is sufficient to identify the finite dimensional distributions. In particular, since $\langle \tau_{-X_t^N} G, \pi_t^N \rangle$ converges to $\int_{\mathbb{T}} G(u - x_t) \rho(t, u) \, du = \int_{\mathbb{T}} G(u) \, \rho(t, x_t + u) \, du$, we have $\tau_{\frac{1}{N}X_t^N} \pi_t^N \to \tau_x \, \pi_t(du) = \rho(\cdot, x_t + u) \, du$ as claimed.

Claim #3. For the 3rd item, we apply Lemma 4.1 to (4.2) by setting h(n) = g(n)/n, $H(\rho) = \Phi(\rho)/\rho$ and $D_{X_s^N}^N \equiv 1$. With $G = \iota_{\theta}$, noting $\eta^{\theta N}(x) = \langle \iota_{\theta}, \pi^N \rangle$ where $\iota_{\theta} = (2\theta)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{[-\theta,\theta]}$, we have by Claim #2 taking $N \to \infty$ that

$$\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \lim_{\theta \to 0} Q\left[\left| A_t - \int_0^t \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \overline{H}_{\ell}(\langle \tau_{x_s} \iota_{\theta}, \pi_s \rangle) du \, ds \right| > \delta \right] = 0 \ , \ \forall \delta > 0 \ , \ \forall t \in [0,T].$$

Since ρ is continuous (Part 2(a) of Lemma 2.11) given $\alpha \in C(\mathbb{T})$ and $\rho_0 \in C^{\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta > 0$, as $\theta \to 0$, we obtain $\langle \tau_{x_s}\iota_{\theta}, \pi_s \rangle \to \rho(s, x_s)$. In addition, by bounded convergence, we have $\overline{H}_{\ell}(\rho) \to H(\rho)$ as $\ell \uparrow \infty$. Therefore, *Q*-a.s.,

$$\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \lim_{\theta \to 0} \int_0^t \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_{-\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \overline{H}_{\ell}(\pi_s(\tau_{x_s}\iota_{\theta}) \, du \, ds = \int_0^t \frac{\Phi(\rho(s, x_s))}{\rho(s, x_s)} \, ds.$$

Claim #4. The quadratic variation $\langle \frac{1}{N}M^N \rangle_t$ converges to A_t by Claim #3. Then, by Proposition IX.1.12 in [19], the martingale $\frac{1}{N}M_t^N$, as its quadratic variation is uniformly bounded in N, converges to a continuous martingale m_t . Hence, by Corollary VI.6.29 in [19], $(\frac{1}{N}M_t^N, \langle \frac{1}{N}M^N \rangle_t)$ converges to $(m_t, \langle m \rangle_t)$, and as $(\frac{1}{N}M_t^N, \langle \frac{1}{N}M^N \rangle_t)$ converges to (m_t, A_t) , the quadratic variation of $\langle m \rangle_t = A_t$.

By Doob's martingale representation Theorem 3.4.2 and Remark 3.4.3 in [12] (noting the derivative of A_t is positive as $\Phi(u)/u \ge g_* > 0$), there exists a Brownian motion B on the probability space (Ω, \mathscr{F}, P) , where m_t, x_t, A_t are defined, with the same filtration $\{\mathscr{F}_t\}$, such that $m_t = \int_0^t \sqrt{\frac{\Phi(\rho(s, x_s))}{\rho(s, x_s)}} dB_s$.

The random environment factor $\alpha_{X_{\cdot}^{N}}^{N} = \alpha_{N(\frac{1}{N}X_{\cdot}^{N})}^{N} = Y_{N(\frac{1}{N}X_{\cdot}^{N})}^{N}$ in the drift term of (4.1). As Y_{N}^{N} converges uniformly to the continuous limit α , we may replace $Y_{N(\frac{1}{N}X_{\cdot}^{N})}^{N}$ with $\alpha(\frac{1}{N}X_{\cdot}^{N})$ in (4.1) with a vanishing deterministic error, since g(n)/n is bounded by (LG). Note that the function $\alpha(x_{\cdot})$ is continuous in x_{\cdot} .

Therefore, applying Lemma 4.1 to the drift term $\int_0^t \alpha(\frac{1}{N}X_s^N) \frac{g(\eta_s(X_s^N))}{\eta_s(X_s^N)} ds$ in (4.1), with h(n) = g(n)/n and $D_{X_s^N}^N = \alpha(\frac{1}{N}X_s^N)$, and performing the same analysis as in the proof of claim #3 yields convergence of $\int_0^t \alpha(\frac{1}{N}X_s^N) \frac{g(\eta_s(X_s^N))}{\eta_s(X_s^N)} ds$ to $\int_0^t \alpha(x_s) \frac{\Phi(\rho(s,x_s))}{\rho(s,x_s)} ds$, the error vanishing in probability with respect to Q_N . We have also $\frac{1}{N}(X_t^N - X_0^N)$ converges in distribution to $x_t - x_0$. By assumption, the initial distribution of $\frac{1}{N}X_0^N$ converges to the law of Z_X . Therefore, x_0 is distributed as Z_X .

Let \hat{x}_t be the 1-periodic extension of x_t . Since Q_N converges weakly to Q, and $\mathscr{U}_{\delta} = \{\hat{x}_t - \hat{x}_0 - C_t - m_t | > \delta\}$ is an open set in C([0,T]), we conclude from the Portmanteau theorem applied to \mathscr{U}_{δ} that $\hat{x}_t - \hat{x}_0 = C_t + m_t$. Hence, there exists a probability space (Ω, \mathscr{F}, P) and a Brownian motion B defined on that probability space for which the convergence point x_t satisfies the stochastic integral equation given in (3.4), interpreted via \hat{x}_t in (3.1). So the triple $((x_t, B), (\Omega, \mathscr{F}, P), \{\mathscr{F}_t\})$ is a weak solution to (3.3).

By the uniqueness of such weak solutions (Theorems III.3.5 (and remark after) and III.3.6 in [7]; see also [24]), given that the diffusion coefficient $\frac{\Phi(\rho(s,x_s))}{\rho(s,x_s)}$ is continuous, positive and bounded above and below, and the drift $\alpha(x_s) \frac{\Phi(\rho(s,x_s))}{\rho(s,x_s)}$ is continuous and bounded, all limit points converge to this solution.

We remark by the same citations, uniqueness of weak solution also holds for \hat{x} . when the initial condition is $\hat{x}_0 = z$ for each $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, the process measure $E_{Z_X}[\mathscr{P}^z]$ discussed in (3.2) governs the distribution of x. when starting from $x_0 \stackrel{d}{=} Z_X$. This completes the proof.

5. Proof of Theorem 3.4: Singular diffusion limit as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$

We focus on the quenched setting in the following. We observe that x^{ε} on \mathbb{T} has representation as a diffusion \hat{x}^{ε} on \mathbb{R} with periodic coefficients (cf. (3.1)). The plan is to take the limit of the Itô-McKean representation of \hat{x}^{ε} , and thereby show Theorem 3.4.

Define $\chi_{\varepsilon}(t,x) = \Phi(\rho^{\varepsilon}(t,x))/\rho^{\varepsilon}(t,x)$ for $\varepsilon > 0$. Recall the process \hat{x}_t^{ε} on \mathbb{R} , with initial value $\hat{x}_0^{\varepsilon} \stackrel{d}{=} Z_W$ and periodic drift $b_{\varepsilon}(t,x) = 2\chi_{\varepsilon}(t,x) W_{\varepsilon}'(x)$ and diffusion coefficient $\sigma_{\varepsilon}^2(t,x) = \chi_{\varepsilon}(t,x)$, bounded above and below. Recall also that its process measure is $E_{Z_X}[\hat{\mathscr{P}}^z]$ where $\hat{\mathscr{P}}^z$ is the process measure when $\hat{x}_0^{\varepsilon} = z \in \mathbb{R}$.

After a few 'steps', Theorem 3.4 is proved at the end of the section.

Step 1. In the quenched setting, that is with respect to a realization of W, define the 'scale' function

$$s_{\varepsilon}(x) = \int_0^x \exp\left(-\int_0^y 2b_{\varepsilon}(t,z)/\sigma_{\varepsilon}^2(t,z)\,dz\right)\,dy = \int_0^x \exp\left(-4\int_0^y W_{\varepsilon}'(z)\,dz\right)\,dy.$$

By exploiting the periodicity of W'_{ε} , we calculate

$$s_{\varepsilon}(x) = \int_{0}^{x} \exp\left(-4\left(\lfloor y \rfloor \int_{0}^{1} W_{\varepsilon}'(z) \, dz + \int_{0}^{y-\lfloor y \rfloor} W_{\varepsilon}'(z) \, dz\right)\right) \, dy.$$
(5.1)

Note, as $W'_{\varepsilon} \in C^{1/2-}(\mathbb{T})$, that $s_{\varepsilon} \in C^{5/2-}(\mathbb{T})$.

We may identify its limit.

Lemma 5.1. In the quenched setting, s_{ε} converges to s_0 , defined in (3.5), uniformly on compact sets of \mathbb{R} . Moreover, since s_{ε} and s_0 are strictly increasing, s_{ε}^{-1} also converges uniformly to s_0^{-1} on compacts sets of \mathbb{R} .

Proof. Since $W'_{\varepsilon}(x) = \frac{d}{dx}(\psi_{\varepsilon} * W)(x)$ in terms of $\psi_{\varepsilon}(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\psi(x/\varepsilon)$ (cf. (2.5)), we compute $\int_{0}^{x} W'_{\varepsilon}(z)dz = (\psi_{\varepsilon} * W)(x) - (\psi_{\varepsilon} * W)(0)$ whose limit is W(x) as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, uniformly on compact sets of \mathbb{R} . In particular, from (5.1), we have $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} s_{\varepsilon}(x) = \int_{0}^{x} \exp\left(-4\left\{\lfloor y \rfloor W(1) + W(y - \lfloor y \rfloor)\right\}\right) dy$. The claim holds.

Step 2. We now observe that $s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}_{t}^{\varepsilon})$ is a martingale by applying Itô's rule: Recall $d\hat{x}_{t}^{\varepsilon} = 2\chi_{\varepsilon}W'_{\varepsilon}dt + \sqrt{\chi_{\varepsilon}}dB_{t}$. Note that $d\langle \hat{x}^{\varepsilon} \rangle_{t} = \chi_{\varepsilon}(t, \hat{x}_{t}^{\varepsilon})dt$, $s'_{\varepsilon}(x) = \exp\left(-4\int_{0}^{x}W'_{\varepsilon}(z)dz\right)$, and $s''_{\varepsilon}(x) = -4W'_{\varepsilon}(x)s'_{\varepsilon}(x)$. Then,

$$ds_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}_{t}^{\varepsilon}) = s_{\varepsilon}'(\hat{x}_{t}^{\varepsilon}) d\hat{x}_{t}^{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{2} s_{\varepsilon}''(\hat{x}_{t}^{\varepsilon}) d\langle \hat{x}^{\varepsilon} \rangle_{t} = \exp\left(-4 \int_{0}^{\hat{x}_{t}^{\varepsilon}} W_{\varepsilon}'(z) dz\right) \sqrt{\chi_{\varepsilon}(t, \hat{x}_{t}^{\varepsilon})} dB_{t}.$$

Hence,

$$s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}_{t}^{\varepsilon}) - s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}_{0}^{\varepsilon}) = \int_{0}^{t} \exp\left(-4\int_{0}^{\hat{x}_{r}^{\varepsilon}} W_{\varepsilon}'(z) \, dz\right) \sqrt{\chi_{\varepsilon}(r, \hat{x}_{r}^{\varepsilon})} \, dB_{r}$$

with quadratic variation

$$\langle s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon}) \rangle_t = \int_0^t \exp\left(-8 \int_0^{\hat{x}_r^{\varepsilon}} W_{\varepsilon}'(z) \, dz\right) \chi_{\varepsilon}(r, \hat{x}_r^{\varepsilon}) \, dr.$$
(5.2)

Clearly, $\langle s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon}) \rangle_t$ is a strictly increasing, continuous process.

Lemma 5.2. The quadratic variation $\langle s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon}) \rangle_t$, as $t \uparrow \infty$, increases to $\langle s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon}) \rangle_{\infty} = \infty$ a.s. with respect to the process measure $E_Z[\hat{\mathscr{P}}^z]$.

Proof. The condition $\langle s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon})\rangle_{\infty} < \infty$ implies a finite limit of the martingale, $\lim_{t\to\infty} s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}_t^{\varepsilon}) - s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}_0^{\varepsilon}) \in \mathbb{R}$, by Proposition IV.1.26 (see also Proposition V.1.8) in [19]. But, $s_{\varepsilon}(\cdot)$ is continuous and strictly increasing. Therefore, finiteness of $\langle s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon})\rangle_{\infty}$ implies finiteness of $\lim_{t\to\infty} \hat{x}_t^{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}$.

Suppose now that $\langle s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon}) \rangle_{\infty} < \infty$. Note that W'_{ε} and the coefficient χ_{ε} is bounded above and below. Then, convergence of \hat{x}^{ε}_t as $t \uparrow \infty$, via the formula (5.2), would imply that $\langle s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon}) \rangle_t$ diverges to infinity, a contradiction. Hence, we must have $\langle s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon}) \rangle_{\infty} = \infty$ a.s.

Step 3. Now, since $s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}_t^{\varepsilon}) - s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}_0^{\varepsilon})$ is a continuous martingale, vanishing at t = 0, by the Dambis-Dubins-Schwarz result, Theorems V.1.6 in [19], we have

$$s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}_{t}^{\varepsilon}) - s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}_{0}^{\varepsilon}) = B_{\langle s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon}) \rangle_{t}}^{\varepsilon}, \tag{5.3}$$

for $t \ge 0$, where B^{ε} is the 'DDS' standard Brownian motion.

Let $T_{\varepsilon}(t)$ be the inverse of the quadratic variation process $\langle s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon}) \rangle_t$, for $t \ge 0$. Note that $d\langle s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon}) \rangle_t = \exp\left(-8 \int_0^{\hat{x}_t^{\varepsilon}} W'_{\varepsilon}(z) dz\right) \chi_{\varepsilon}(t, \hat{x}_t^{\varepsilon}) dt$ and $\langle s(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon}) \rangle'_{T_{\varepsilon}(t)} T'_{\varepsilon}(t) = 1$. Then, via (5.3), we have

$$T_{\varepsilon}(t) = \int_{0}^{t} \exp\left(8\int_{0}^{s_{\varepsilon}^{-1}(s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}_{0}^{\varepsilon}) + B_{r}^{\varepsilon})} W_{\varepsilon}'(z) \, dz\right) \frac{1}{\chi_{\varepsilon}(r, s_{\varepsilon}^{-1}(s_{\varepsilon}(\hat{x}_{0}^{\varepsilon}) + B_{r}^{\varepsilon}))} \, dr, \tag{5.4}$$

a strictly increasing and onto function on $[0, \infty)$.

Step 4. We now consider the case $Z_X = z \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant.

Lemma 5.3. The process $\hat{x}_t^{\varepsilon,z} = s_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \left(s_{\varepsilon}(z) + B^{\varepsilon}(T_{\varepsilon}^{-1}(t)) \right)$ on \mathbb{R} converges in distribution to the process $\hat{x}_t^{0,z} = s_0^{-1} \left(s_0(z) + B^0(T_0^{-1}(t)) \right)$, defined near (3.5), in probability with respect to \mathbb{P}_W .

Proof. We prove convergence in \mathbb{P}_W -probability of $\hat{x}_t^{\varepsilon,z}$ to $\hat{x}_t^{0,z}$ in distribution by showing that any subsequence $\hat{x}_t^{\varepsilon_n}$ has a further subsequence converging in distribution to \hat{x}_t^0 , almost surely with respect to \mathbb{P}_W . In other words, let $F: C([0,T]) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded continuous function and \mathbb{P}_B be the law of a Brownian motion B. Since, given the realization W, the laws of x^{ε} and x^0 can be written in terms of a Brownian motion, we show that any subsequence of $E_{\mathbb{P}_{B^\varepsilon}}[F(x^{\varepsilon})] = E_{\mathbb{P}_B}[F(x^{\varepsilon})]$ has a further subsequence which converges to $E_{\mathbb{P}_{B^0}}[F(x^0)] = E_{\mathbb{P}_B}[F(x^0)]$, a.s. \mathbb{P}_W .

We may also view T_{ε} and T_0 as functions of a Brownian path. In this sense, it suffices to show with respect to a realization B a.s. \mathbb{P}_B that there exists a subsequence $\bar{\varepsilon}_k := \varepsilon_{n_k}$ such that $T_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k} \to T_0$ uniformly on $[0, T^{\#}]$, a.s.- \mathbb{P}_W for each $T^{\#} > 0$. For, if this holds, then there is a common subsequence $\bar{\varepsilon}_k$ such that $T_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k} \to T_0$ uniformly on [0, N] for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ a.s.- \mathbb{P}_W . Then, it follows $T_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}^{-1} \to T_0^{-1}$ uniformly on [0, T], a.s.- \mathbb{P}_W . Combining with the continuity of the Brownian path Band the uniform convergence of $s_{\varepsilon} \to s_0$ and $s_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \to s_0^{-1}$ on compact subsets of \mathbb{R} (Lemma 5.1), we may show the desired result by bounded convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} E_{\mathbb{P}_B}[F(\hat{x}^{\bar{\varepsilon}_k})] = \lim_{k \to \infty} E_{\mathbb{P}_B}[F(s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}^{-1}(s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}(z) + B(T_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}^{-1}(\cdot))))] \\ = E_{\mathbb{P}_B}[F(s_0^{-1}(s_0(z) + B(T_0^{-1}(\cdot))))] = E_{\mathbb{P}_B}[F(\hat{x}^0)], \mathbb{P}_W - \text{a.s.}$$

To show there is a sequence $\bar{\varepsilon}_k$ such that $T_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}$ converges to T_0 uniformly on $[0, T^{\#}]$, notice that by the continuity of B, the compactness of $[0, T^{\#}]$, and the uniform convergence of s_{ε} and s_{ε}^{-1} on compact subsets, the first factor in the integrand of $T_{\varepsilon}(t)$ in (5.4) converges uniformly on $[0, T^{\#}]$: That is, by periodicity of W'_{ε} ,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_0^{s_{\varepsilon}^{-1}(s_{\varepsilon}(z)+B_r)} W_{\varepsilon}'(z) \, dz = \lfloor s_0^{-1}(s_0(z)+B_r) \rfloor W(1) + W(s_0^{-1}(s_0(z)+B_r) - \lfloor s_0^{-1}(s_0(z)+B_r) \rfloor).$$

In addition, since $\Phi(u)/u$ is smooth and bounded below and above (cf. Lemma 2.11 with time horizon $T^{\#}$), the uniform convergence of a subsequence $\chi_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}$ to χ_0 and therefore $1/\chi_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}$ to $1/\chi_0$ follows from $\rho^{\varepsilon} \to \rho^0$ in $\mathscr{L}_{T^{\#}}^{\alpha-1}$ where $\alpha \in (13/9, 3/2)$ in probability w.r.t \mathbb{P}_W globally in time.

Indeed, first, by Lemma 2.11, given the assumption $\rho_0 \in C^{1+\beta}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\beta > 0$, we are assured that $\rho^{\varepsilon} \in \mathscr{L}_{T^{\#}}^{\alpha-1}$ is the gradient of the unique para-controlled solution of (2.15). Second, recalling the definition of $\mathscr{L}_{T^{\#}}^{\alpha-1}$, the convergence in probability in Theorem 2.13 (with time horizon $T^{\#}$) allows to choose a subsequence $\bar{\varepsilon}_k$ so that $\rho^{\bar{\varepsilon}_k} \to \rho^0$ uniformly in $[0, T^{\#}]$ a.s.- \mathbb{P}_W . Then, $|\chi_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}(t, s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}^{-1}(s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}(z) + B_t)) - \chi_0(t, s_0^{-1}(s_0(z) + B_t))|$ is bounded above by

$$|\chi_{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}(t, s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}^{-1}(s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}(z)+B_{t}))-\chi_{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}(t, s_{0}^{-1}(s_{0}(z)+B_{t}))|+|\chi_{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}(t, s_{0}^{-1}(s_{0}(z)+B_{t}))-\chi_{0}(t, s_{0}^{-1}(s_{0}(z)+B_{t}))|.$$

Observe that the second term vanishes in the limit since $\chi_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k} \to \chi_0$ uniformly. For the first term, note that the function $\Phi(\rho)/\rho$ is Lipschitz for $\rho \in [\rho_-, \rho_+]$ since Φ is continuously differentiable. Therefore, we have

$$|\chi_{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}(t, s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}^{-1}(s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}(z) + B_{t})) - \chi_{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}(t, s_{0}^{-1}(s_{0}(z) + B_{t}))| \\ \leq ||\chi_{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}||_{Lip} |\rho^{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}(t, s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}^{-1}(s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}(z) + B_{t})) - \rho^{\bar{\varepsilon}_{k}}(t, s_{0}^{-1}(s_{0}(z) + B_{t}))|.$$

We may bound the second factor on the right hand side as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\rho^{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}(t, s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}^{-1}(s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}(z) + B_t)) - \rho^{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}(t, s_0^{-1}(s_0(z) + B_t))| \\ &\leq [\rho^{\bar{\varepsilon}}]_{\alpha - 1} \sup_{t \in [0,T]} |s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}^{-1}(s_{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}(z) + B_t) - s_0^{-1}(s_0(z) + B_t)|^{\beta} \end{aligned}$$

where $[\rho^{\bar{\varepsilon}}]_{\alpha-1}$ is the Hölder constant of $\rho^{\bar{\varepsilon}}$. Since $\rho^{\bar{\varepsilon}_k}$ converges to ρ^0 in $\mathscr{L}_{T^{\#}}^{\alpha-1} = C_{T^{\#}}C^{\alpha-1} \cap C_{T^{\#}}^{(\alpha-1)/2}L^{\infty}$ (note $\hat{C}^{\alpha-1} = C^{\alpha-1}$ as $\alpha \in (13/9, 3/2)$; see remark after Lemma 2.11), we have $[\rho^{\bar{\varepsilon}}]_{\alpha-1}$ converges to $[\rho^0]_{\alpha-1} < \infty$. Then, given $s_{\varepsilon}, s_{\varepsilon}^{-1}$ converges to s_0, s_0^{-1} uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{R} (Lemma 5.1), the right hand side vanishes.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Consider the definition $x_t^{\varepsilon, Z_X} = \hat{x}_t^{\varepsilon, Z_X} - \lfloor \hat{x}_t^{\varepsilon, Z_X} \rfloor$. Note that the law of x_0^{ε} is the law of Z_X for each $\varepsilon \ge 0$. Note also that $\lfloor x \rfloor : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{T}$ is a continuous function. Recall the equivalence of a sequence converging in \mathbb{P}_W -probability with every subsequence having a further subsequence converging \mathbb{P}_W -a.s.

We have $E[F(x^{\varepsilon,Z_X})] = E_{Z_X}[E_{\mathbb{P}_B}[F(\hat{x}^{\varepsilon,z} - \lfloor x^{\varepsilon,z} \rfloor)]]$ for a bounded, continuous function $F: C([0,T],\mathbb{T}) \to \infty$. The inner expectation converges to $G(z;W) = E_{\mathbb{P}_B}[F(\hat{x}^{0,z} - \lfloor x^{0,z} \rfloor)]$ in \mathbb{P}_W -probability by Lemma 5.3. Since G is bounded, by the equivalence in terms of subsequences, by bounded convergence, we conclude the full expectation converges to $E_{Z_X}[G(z;W)]$ in \mathbb{P}_W -probability. Hence, the desired quenched limit is found. As remarked after Theorem 3.4, the annealed part follows as a consequence.

6. Completion of the proof of Lemma 4.1

We supply the needed estimates of the three terms on the right-hand side of (4.4) in the following three subsections to finish the proof of Lemma 4.1. The scheme has some similarity with that in [9], [10], although there are many differences here given the context of the inhomogeneous environment. In this regard, estimates from [15] will be useful.

6.1. Local 1-block. In the proof of Lemma 4.1, the local 1-block deals with the first term in (4.4). In this term, $h(\eta_t(X_t^N))$ is replaced by an average quantity $H(\eta_t^{\ell}(X_t^N))$ indexed by variables in the local ℓ -neighborhood of $X_t^N \in \mathbb{T}_N$. We use a Rayleigh-type estimation of a variational eigenvalue expression derived from a Feynman-Kac bound. Dirichlet forms and spectral gap bounds play an important role.

6.1.1. Dirichlet forms. Recall the generator \mathscr{L}_N , cf. (2.2), and the invariant measure ν^N (cf. (2.10), where $\phi_{k,N}$ is taken so that $\max_k \phi_{k,N} = 1$. As ν^N is not reversible with respect to \mathscr{L}_N , we will work with $\mathscr{S}_N = (\mathscr{L}_N + \mathscr{L}_N^*)/2$, the symmetric part of \mathscr{L}_N :

$$\mathscr{S}_{N}f(x,\eta) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq x} \sum_{\pm} g(\eta(k))\mathfrak{p}_{k,\pm}^{N} \left(f(x,\eta^{k,k\pm 1}) - f(x,\eta) \right) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\pm} \left\{ g(\eta(x)) \frac{\eta(x) - 1}{\eta(x)} \mathfrak{p}_{x,\pm}^{N} \left(f(x,\eta^{x,x\pm 1}) - f(x,\eta) \right) \right. \\ + \frac{1}{2} \frac{g(\eta(x))}{\eta(x)} \mathfrak{p}_{x,\pm}^{N} \left(f(x\pm 1,\eta^{x,x\pm 1}) - f(x,\eta) \right) \right\}.$$

where $\mathfrak{p}_{k,\pm}^N := \left(\frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{\alpha_k^N}{N}\right) + \frac{\phi_{k+1,N}}{\phi_{k,N}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mp \frac{\alpha_{k+1}^N}{N}\right).$

Then, ν^N is reversible with respect to the generator \mathscr{S}_N . Recall $\nu^{env,x}$ (cf. near (2.10)). Similarly, $\nu^{env,x}$ is reversible under $\mathscr{S}_N^{env,x} = (\mathscr{L}_N^{env,x} + \mathscr{L}_N^{*,env,x})/2$, dropping the terms in \mathscr{S}_N where the tagged particle moves. The Dirichlet form $\mathscr{D}(f)$ with respect to \mathscr{S}_N is

$$E_{\nu^{N}}\left[f(-\mathscr{S}_{N}f)\right] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq x} E_{\nu^{N}}\left[g(\eta(k))\mathfrak{p}_{k,+}^{N}\left(f(x,\eta^{k,k+1}) - f(x,\eta)\right)^{2}\right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} E_{\nu^{N}}\left[g(\eta(x))\frac{\eta(x) - 1}{\eta(x)}\mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^{N}\left(f(x,\eta^{x,x+1}) - f(x,\eta)\right)^{2}\right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} E_{\nu^{N}}\left[\frac{g(\eta(x))}{\eta(x)}\mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^{N}\left(f(x+1,\eta^{x,x+1}) - f(x,\eta)\right)^{2}\right],$$
(6.1)

while the Dirichlet form $\mathscr{D}^{env,x}(f)$ with respect to $\mathscr{S}_N^{env,x}$ equals

$$\begin{split} E_{\nu^{env,x}}\left[f(-\mathscr{S}_{N}^{env,x}f)\right] &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq x} E_{\nu^{env,x}} \left[g(\eta(k))\mathfrak{p}_{k,+}^{N}\left(f(x,\eta^{k,k+1}) - f(x,\eta)\right)^{2}\right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} E_{\nu^{env,x}} \left[g(\eta(x))\frac{\eta(x) - 1}{\eta(x)}\mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^{N}\left(f(x,\eta^{x,x+1}) - f(x,\eta)\right)^{2}\right]. \end{split}$$

We comment if f did not depend on $\eta(x-1), \eta(x), \eta(x+1)$ then $\mathscr{D}^{x,env}(f) = \langle f, -Lf \rangle_{\mathscr{R}_N}$, reducing to the Dirichlet form with respect to the standard process (cf. (2.1)).

6.1.2. Spectral gap bound. For $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$ and $l \ge 1$, denote $\Lambda_{k,l} = \{k - l, k - l + 1, \dots, k + l\} \subset \mathbb{T}_N$. Consider the two processes restricted to $\Lambda_{k,l}$ generated by $S_{k,l}$ and $S_{k,l}^{env}$ where

$$S_{k,l}f(\eta) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x,x+1\in\Lambda_{k,l}\\x+1\in\Lambda_{k,l}}} \left\{ g(\eta(x))\mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^{N} \left(f(\eta^{x,x+1}) - f(\eta) \right) + g(\eta(x+1))\mathfrak{p}_{x+1,-}^{N} \left(f(\eta^{x+1,x}) - f(\eta) \right) \right\}.$$

$$S_{k,l}^{env}f(\eta) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x\in\Lambda_{k,l}\setminus\{k\}\\x+1\in\Lambda_{k,l}}} \left\{ g(\eta(x))\mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^{N} \left(f(\eta^{x,x+1}) - f(\eta) \right) + g(\eta(x+1))\mathfrak{p}_{x+1,-}^{N} \left(f(\eta^{x+1,x}) - f(\eta) \right) \right\}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\pm} g(\eta(k)) \frac{\eta(k) - 1}{\eta(k)} \mathfrak{p}_{k,\pm}^{N} \left(f(\eta^{k,k\pm 1}) - f(\eta) \right).$$

Let also $S_{k,l}^0$ and $S_{k,l}^{0,env}$ be these generators when $\alpha_{\cdot}^N \equiv 0$.

Let $\Omega_{k,l} = \mathbb{N}_{0}^{\Lambda_{k,l}}$ be the state space of configurations restricted on sites $\Lambda_{k,l}$. For each $\eta \in \Omega_{k,l}$, define $\kappa_{k,l}(\eta) = \prod_{x \in \Lambda_{k,l}} \mathcal{P}_{\phi_{x,N}}(\eta(x))$, that is, $\kappa_{k,l}$ is the product measure \mathscr{R}_N restricted to $\Omega_{k,l}$. Define also $\kappa_{k,l}^{env}(\eta) = \frac{\eta(k)}{\rho_{k,N}} \kappa_{k,l}(\eta)$, the measure $\nu^{env,k}$ (which conditions X = k), restricted to $\eta \in \Omega_{k,l}$. Define also $\kappa_{k,l}^{0}$ and $\kappa_{k,l}^{0,env}$ to be the measures $\kappa_{k,l}$ and $\kappa_{k,l}^{env}$ when $\alpha_{\cdot}^{N} \equiv 0$. Let $\rho^* \equiv \rho_{k,N}$ when $\alpha_{\cdot}^{N} = 0$ (corresponding to $\phi = 1$).

Let $\Omega_{k,l,j} = \{\eta \in \Omega_{k,l} : \sum_{x \in \Lambda_{k,l}} \eta(x) = j\}$ be the state space of configurations with exactly j particles on the sites $\Lambda_{k,l}$. Let $\kappa_{k,l,j}$ and $\kappa_{k,l,j}^{env}$ be the associated reversible canonical measures obtained by conditioning $\kappa_{k,l}$ and $\kappa_{k,l}^{env}$ on $\Omega_{k,l}$, and $\kappa_{k,l,j}^{0,env}$ these measures when $\alpha_{k,l}^{N} \equiv 0$.

The corresponding Dirichlet forms $\mathscr{D}_{k,l}$, $\mathscr{D}_{k,l,j}$, and $\mathscr{D}_{k,l}^{env}$, $\mathscr{D}_{k,l,j}^{env}$ are given respectively by

$$E_{\bar{\kappa}}\left[f(-S_{k,l}f)\right] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,x+1 \in \Lambda_{k,l}} E_{\bar{\kappa}}\left[g(\eta(x))\mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^{N}\left(f(\eta^{x,x+1}) - f(\eta)\right)^{2}\right],$$

and

$$E_{\bar{\kappa}^{env}}\left[f(-S_{k,l}^{env}f)\right] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x \in \Lambda_{k,l} \setminus \{k\}\\x+1 \in \Lambda_{k,l}}} E_{\bar{\kappa}^{env}}\left[g(\eta(x))\mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^{N}\left(f(\eta^{x,x+1}) - f(\eta)\right)^{2}\right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} E_{\bar{\kappa}^{env}}\left[g(\eta(k))\frac{\eta(k) - 1}{\eta(k)}\mathfrak{p}_{k,+}^{N}\left(f(\eta^{k,k+1}) - f(\eta)\right)^{2}\right]$$

with $\bar{\kappa}$ equal to $\kappa_{k,l}$ and $\kappa_{k,l,j}$, and $\bar{\kappa}^{env}$ equal to $\kappa^{env}_{k,l}$ and $\kappa^{env}_{k,l,j}$.

We will obtain spectral gap estimates for the localized inhomogeneous processes by comparison with the spectral gap for the translation-invariant localized process generated by $S_{k,l}^0$. For $j \ge 1$, let $b_{l,j}$ and $b_{l,j}^{env}$ (which does not depend on the location k) be the reciprocals of the spectral gaps of $-S_{k,l}^0$ and $-S_{k,l}^{0,env}$ on $\Omega_{k,l,j}$ (cf. p. 374, [13]):

$$b_{l,j} := \inf_{f} \frac{E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}^{0}}[f(-S_{k,l}^{0}f)]}{\operatorname{Var}_{\kappa_{k,l,j}^{0}}(f)} \quad \text{and} \quad b_{l,j}^{env} := \inf_{f} \frac{E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}^{0,env}}[f(-S_{k,l}^{0,env}f)]}{\operatorname{Var}_{\kappa_{k,l,j}^{0,env}}(f)}.$$
(6.2)

As $\Omega_{k,l,j}$ is a finite space, the infimum in the above formula is taken over all functions f from $\Omega_{k,l,j}$ to \mathbb{R} . For all $l, j \geq 1$, we have $b_{l,j} > 0$. By Lemma 6.2 in [9] (or Lemma 3.1 in [10]), as $g_* \leq g(n)/n \leq g^*$ is bounded above and below by assumptions (LG) and (M), we have

$$b_{l,j}^{env} \le (g^*g_*^{-1})^2 b_{l,j}$$

6.1.3. Inhomogeneous comparison. We now state estimates which quantify expressions with respect to the inhomogeneous $\kappa_{k,l,j}^{env}$ to those under $\nu_{l,k,j}^{0,env}$. The following lemma is the counterpart of Lemma 6.1 in [15] when the measures are in terms of the 'environment' process where the tagged particle location is fixed.

Recall $\mathfrak{p}_{k,+}^N$ in Section 6.1.1. Let $r_{k,l,N}^{-1} := \min_{x \in \Lambda_{k,l}} \{\mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^N\}.$

Lemma 6.1. We have the following estimates:

(1) Uniform bound: For all $\eta \in \Omega_{k,l,j}$, we have

$$\left(\frac{\phi_{\min,k,l}}{\phi_{\max,k,l}}\right)^{2j} \le \frac{\kappa_{k,l,j}^{env}(\eta)}{\kappa_{k,l,j}^{0,env}(\eta)} \le \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\right)^{2j}$$

where $\phi_{\min,k,l} = \min_{x \in \Lambda_{k,l}} \phi_{x,N}$ and $\phi_{\max,k,l} = \max_{x \in \Lambda_{k,l}} \phi_{x,N}$. (2) Poincaré inequality: We have for $j \ge 1$,

$$\operatorname{Var}_{\kappa_{k,l,j}^{env}}(f) \le C_{k,l,j} E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}^{env}} \left[f(-S_{k,l}^{env}f) \right]$$

where $C_{k,l,j} := (g^*g_*^{-1})^2 b_{l,j}^{-1} r_{k,l,N} \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\right)^{4j}$ bounds the inverse of the spectral gap of $-S_{k,l}^{env}$ on $\Omega_{k,l,j}$.

(3) For each l fixed and C = C(l) > 0, we have

$$\lim_{l \uparrow \infty} \sup_{1 \le k \le N} \sup_{j \le C \log(N)} \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}} \right)^{4j} = 1, \quad \lim_{N \uparrow \infty} \sup_{1 \le k \le N} r_{k,l,N} = 1$$

and hence, given (2.3), for fixed l and C = C(l) > 0, we have

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \sup_{1 \le k \le N} \sup_{1 \le j \le C \log(N)} \frac{1}{N} C_{k,l,j} = 0.$$

Proof. For part (1), write

$$\kappa_{k,l,j}^{env}(\eta) = \frac{\kappa_{k,l}^{env}(\eta)}{\kappa_{k,l}^{env}(\Omega_{k,l,j})} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_{k,l,j}^{0,env}(\eta) = \frac{\kappa_{k,l}^{0,env}(\eta)}{\kappa_{k,l}^{0,env}(\Omega_{k,l,j})}$$

We may write

$$\kappa_{k,l}^{env}(\eta) = \frac{\eta(k)}{\rho_{k,N}} \kappa_{k,l}(\eta) \text{ and } \kappa_{k,l}^{0,env}(\eta) = \frac{\eta(k)}{\rho^*} \kappa_{k,l}^0(\eta).$$

Hence, $\kappa_{k,l}^{env}(\eta)/\kappa_{k,l}^{0,env}(\eta)$ equals $\frac{\rho^*}{\rho_{k,N}}\frac{\kappa_{k,l}(\eta)}{\kappa_{k,l}^0(\eta)}$.

Via the proof of Part (1) of Lemma 6.1 in [15], corresponding to the part (1) above, we have

$$\left(\frac{\phi_{\min,k,l}}{\phi_{\max,k,l}}\right)^{2j} \le \frac{\kappa_{k,l}(\eta)}{\kappa_{k,l}^0(\eta)} \le \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\right)^{2j} \tag{6.3}$$

and therefore the ratio $\kappa_{k,l}^{env}(\eta)/\kappa_{k,l}^{0,env}(\eta)$, as $\eta(k)$ cancels, has the same lower and upper bounds, except they are multiplied by $\rho^*/\rho_{k,N}$. Moreover, since $\kappa_{k,l}^{env}(\Omega_{k,l,j}) = \sum_{\eta \in \Omega_{k,l,j}} \kappa_{k,l}^{env}(\eta)$, by writing $\kappa_{k,l}^{env}(\eta) = (\kappa_{k,l}^{env}(\eta)/\kappa_{k,l}^{0}(\eta))\kappa_{k,l}^{0}(\eta)$, we may estimate the ratio $\kappa_{k,l}^{0}(\Omega_{k,l,j})/\kappa_{k,l}^{env}(\Omega_{k,l,j})$ similarly. Combining the above estimates straightforwardly, yields part (1).

Part (2) follows similarly, using the corresponding Part (2) of Lemma 6.1 in [15].

Part (3) follows from Lemma 2.1, which gives that $\frac{\phi_{max,k,l}}{\phi_{min,k,l}} = 1 + O(l/N)$, and also that $\mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^N = 1 + O(1/N).$ \square

6.1.4. Mean zero replacement. In the upcoming proof of the local 1-block, we will need to replace $h(\eta(x)) - H(\eta^l(x))$ by a mean zero function with respect to the measure $\kappa_{k,l,j}^{env}$.

Recall that h is bounded and Lipschitz.

Lemma 6.2. We have, C = C(l) > 0 depending on l, that

$$\limsup_{l \to \infty} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{T}_N} \sup_{j \le C \log N} \left| E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}^{env}}[h(\eta(k))] - H(j/(2l+1))] \right| = 0.$$

Proof. We now make use of the estimates in Lemma 6.1 to deduce

$$\left(\frac{\phi_{\min,k,l}}{\phi_{\max,k,l}}\right)^{2j} E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}^{0,env}}[h(\eta(k))] \le E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}^{env}}[h(\eta(k))] \le \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\right)^{2j} E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}^{0,env}}[h(\eta(k))].$$

Note that the ratio $(\phi_{max,k,l}/\phi_{min,k,l})^{2j}$ converges to 1 uniformly over $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$ and $j \leq C \log(N)$ as $N \uparrow \infty$. Since h is bounded, the desired convergence follows from the convergence of

$$\sup_{j\geq 0} |E_{\kappa_{k,l,j}^{0,env}}[h(\eta(k))] - H(j/(2l+1))|,$$

which does not depend on $k \in \mathbb{T}_N$, as $l \to \infty$ to 0, as given by Lemma 6.4 in [9] for bounded, Lipschitz h. \square

6.1.5. Local 1-block replacement. We now give the main estimate of the section.

Lemma 6.3 (Local 1-block). With the same notation as in Lemma 4.1,

$$\limsup_{\ell \to \infty} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^{N} \left[\left| \int_{0}^{t} D_{X_{s}^{N}}^{N} \left(h(\eta_{s}(X_{s}^{N})) - H(\eta_{s}^{\ell}(X_{s}^{N})) \right) ds \right| \right] = 0.$$

Proof. Denote by $V_{\ell}(X_s^N, \eta_s)$ the integrand appearing in the statement of this lemma. Since h and D_{ℓ}^{N} are uniformly bounded, V_{ℓ} is also bounded. By the truncation in Lemma 2.6, it suffices to show

$$\limsup_{\ell \to \infty} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^{N} \left[\int_{0}^{t} V_{\ell}(X_{s}^{N}, \eta_{s}) \mathbb{1}_{G_{N,\ell}}(X_{s}^{N}, \eta_{s}) \, ds \right] = 0,$$

where $G_{N,\ell} = \{(x,\eta) : \eta^{\ell}(x) \le C \log N\}.$

Applying the entropy inequality to the above expectation yields

$$\mathbb{E}^{N}\left[\int_{0}^{t} V_{\ell}(X_{s}^{N},\eta_{s})\mathbb{1}_{G_{N,\ell}}(X_{s}^{N},\eta_{s})\,ds\right]$$

$$\leq \frac{\mathscr{H}(\mu^{N}\,|\,\nu^{N})}{N\gamma} + \frac{1}{N\gamma}\log E_{\nu^{N}}\left[\exp\left(\gamma N\left|\int_{0}^{t} V_{\ell}(X_{s}^{N},\eta_{s})\mathbb{1}_{G_{N,\ell}}(X_{s}^{N},\eta_{s})\,ds\right|\right)\right]$$

$$\geq \frac{26}{N\gamma}$$

By (2.4), the first term vanishes as $\gamma \to \infty$. It remains to estimate the second term. We may remove the absolute value in the second term by applying the inequality $e^{|x|} \leq e^x + e^{-x}$ and $\limsup \frac{1}{N} \log(a_N + b_N) \leq \max\{\limsup \frac{1}{N} \log a_N, \limsup \frac{1}{N} \log b_N\}$. We need only estimate

$$\frac{1}{\gamma N} \log E_{\nu^N} \left[\exp\left(\gamma N \int_0^t V_\ell(X_s^N, \eta_s) \mathbb{1}_{G_{N,\ell}}(X_s^N, \eta_s) \, ds \right) \right].$$
(6.4)

As the time-scaled process (X_s^N, η_s^N) has generator $N^2 \mathscr{L}_N$ where \mathscr{L}_N is defined in (2.2), we may apply Lemma 7.2 in Appendix 1 [13] to bound (6.4) by

$$\frac{t}{\gamma N} \sup_{\|f\|_{L^2(\nu^N)} = 1} \langle (N^2 \mathscr{L} + \gamma N V_\ell \, \mathbb{1}_{G_{N,\ell}}) \, f, f \rangle_{\nu^N} = t \sup_{\|f\|_{L^2(\nu^N)} = 1} \langle V_\ell \, \mathbb{1}_{G_{N,\ell}} \, f, f \rangle_{\nu^N} - \frac{N}{\gamma} \mathscr{D}(f).$$
(6.5)

By first conditioning on the values of X, and then dropping the nonnegative 'tagged particle terms' in line (6.1), we may bound $\mathscr{D}(f) \geq \sum_{x} \nu^{N}(X = x) \mathscr{D}^{env,x}(f(x, \cdot))$. Note that $\nu^{N}(X = x) = \rho_{x,N} / \|\rho_{\cdot,N}\|_{L^{1}(\mathbb{T}_{N})}$. We may divide and multiply each function $f(x, \cdot)$ by $\sqrt{E_{\nu^{env,x}}[f^{2}]}$, noting that $f^{x} = f(x, \cdot) / \sqrt{E_{\nu^{env,x}}[f^{2}]}$ has $L^{2}(\nu^{env,x})$ norm 1.

Then, (6.5) is less than

$$\sup_{\|f\|_{L^{2}(\nu^{N})}=1} \sum_{x} \nu^{N}(X=x) E_{\nu^{env,x}}[f^{2}] \Big\{ \langle V_{\ell} \mathbb{1}_{G_{N,\ell}} f^{x}, f^{x} \rangle_{\nu^{x,env}} - \frac{N}{\gamma} \mathscr{D}^{env,x}(f^{x}) \Big\}$$

$$\leq \sup_{x} \sup_{\|f\|_{L^{2}(\nu^{x,env})}=1} \Big\{ \langle V_{\ell} \mathbb{1}_{G_{N,\ell}} f, f \rangle_{\nu^{x,env}} - \frac{N}{\gamma} \mathscr{D}^{x,env}(f) \Big\}.$$

Since V_{ℓ} depends only on $\Omega_{x,\ell}$ in $\langle V_{\ell} \mathbb{1}_{G_{N,\ell}} f, f \rangle_{\nu^{env,x}}$, we may replace f by its conditional expectation given $\Omega_{x,\ell}$, denoted \hat{f} , and $\nu^{env,x}$ by $\kappa_{x,\ell}^{env}$. By convexity and dropping terms for jumps outside of $\Lambda_{x,\ell}$, the Dirichlet form $\mathscr{D}^{env,x}(f) \geq \mathscr{D}_{x,\ell}^{env}(\hat{f})$. Hence, we bound the last display by

$$\sup_{x} \sup_{\|f\|_{L^{2}(\kappa_{x,\ell}^{env})}=1} \Big\{ \langle V_{\ell} \, \mathbb{1}_{G_{N,\ell}} f, f \rangle_{\kappa_{x,\ell}^{env}} - \frac{N}{\gamma} \mathscr{D}_{x,\ell}^{env}(f) \Big\}.$$

$$(6.6)$$

One may now condition on the number j of particles in $\Lambda_{x,\ell}$. Because of the truncation, we may limit to $j \leq C\ell \log(N)$. Again, for each j, we may multiply and divide by $\sqrt{E_{\kappa_{x,\ell,j}^{env}}[f^2]}$. Denote by \tilde{f} the function $f/\sqrt{E_{\kappa_{x,\ell,j}^{env}}[f^2]}$. Since for $j \leq Cl \log(N)$, we bound (6.6) by

$$\sup_{x} \sup_{\|f\|_{L^{2}(\kappa_{x,\ell}^{env})}=1} \sum_{j \leq C\ell \log(N)} \kappa_{x,\ell}^{env}(\Omega_{x,\ell,j}) E_{\kappa_{x,\ell,j}^{env}}[f^{2}] \Big\{ \langle V_{\ell} \,\tilde{f}, \tilde{f} \rangle_{\kappa_{x,\ell,j}^{env}} - \frac{N}{\gamma} \mathscr{D}_{x,\ell,j}^{env}(\tilde{f}) \Big\} \\
\leq \sup_{x} \sup_{j \leq C\ell \log(N)} \sup_{\|f\|_{L^{2}(\kappa_{x,\ell,j}^{env})}=1} \Big\{ \langle V_{\ell} \,f, f \rangle_{\kappa_{x,\ell,j}^{env}} - \frac{N}{\gamma} \mathscr{D}_{x,\ell,j}^{env}(f) \Big\}.$$
(6.7)

By Lemma 6.2, the difference $H(j/(2\ell+1)) - E_{\kappa_{x,\ell,j}^{env}}[h(\eta(0))]$ vanishes, taking note of the restrictions and order of the limits. Therefore, we may replace V_{ℓ} by $V_{x,\ell,j} = D_x^N(h(\eta(x)) - E_{\kappa_{x,\ell,j}^{env}}[h(\eta(0))])$, which is mean zero with respect to $\kappa_{x,\ell,j}^{env}$. Applying Rayleigh's expansion, Theorem 1.1 in Appendix 3 [13], yields that (6.7) the is bounded above by

$$\frac{(\gamma/N)\langle (-S_{x,\ell}^{env})^{-1}V_{x,\ell,j}, V_{x,\ell,j}\rangle_{L^2(\kappa_{x,\ell,j}^{env})}}{1-2\|V_{x,\ell,j}\|_{\infty}(\gamma/N)C_{x,\ell,j}} \le \frac{(\gamma/N)C_{x,\ell,j}\|V_{x,\ell,j}\|_{L^2(\kappa_{x,\ell,j}^{env})}}{1-2\|V_{x,\ell,j}\|_{\infty}(\gamma/N)C_{x,\ell,j}}$$

Since $(1/N)C_{x,\ell,j}$ vanishes as $N \uparrow \infty$ by Lemma 6.1, and H and D^N_{\cdot} are uniformly bounded, we conclude the argument.

6.2. Local 2-block. We now detail the 2-block estimate following the outline of the 1-block estimate, which will treat the second term in (4.4) in the proof of Lemma 4.1. We will be able to replace $H(\eta^{\ell}(x))$ by an average of $H(\eta^{\ell}(X^{N} + x))$ for x in a small macroscopic ϵN neighborhood of X^{N} .

Recall the notation $\Lambda_{k,l}$ from the 1-block estimate. For $l \geq 1$ and k, k' such that |k - k'| > 2land $k + l \leq k' - l$, let $\Lambda_{k,k',l} = \Lambda_{k,l} \cup \Lambda_{k',l}$. We introduce the following localized generators $S_{k,k',l}$ and $S_{k,k',l}^{env}$ governing a process on $\Omega_{k,k',l} = \mathbb{N}_0^{\Lambda_{k,k',l}}$. Inside each block, the process moves as before, but we add an extra bond interaction between sites k + l and k' - l. Define

$$S_{k,k',l}f(\eta) = S_{k,l}f(\eta) + S_{k',l}f(\eta) + \frac{1}{2}g(\eta(k+l))\mathfrak{p}_{k+l,k'-l}^{N}\left(f(\eta^{k+l,k'-l}) - f(\eta)\right) + \frac{1}{2}g(\eta(k'-l))\mathfrak{p}_{k'-l,k+l}^{N}\left(f(\eta^{k'-l,k+l}) - f(\eta)\right)$$

where $\mathfrak{p}_{k+l,k'-l}^{N} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\alpha_{k+l}^{N}}{N} + \frac{\phi_{k'-l,N}}{\phi_{k+l,N}} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha_{k'-l}^{N}}{N}\right)$ and $\mathfrak{p}_{k'-l,k+l}^{N} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha_{k'-l}^{N}}{N} + \frac{\phi_{k+l,N}}{\phi_{k'-l,N}} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\alpha_{k+l}^{N}}{N}\right)$.

Define also

$$S_{k,k',l}^{env}f(\eta) = S_{k,l}^{env}f(\eta) + S_{k',l}f(\eta) + \frac{1}{2}g(\eta(k+l))\mathfrak{p}_{k+l,k'-l}^{N}\left(f(\eta^{k+l,k'-l}) - f(\eta)\right) + \frac{1}{2}g(\eta(k'-l))\mathfrak{p}_{k'-l,k+l}^{N}\left(f(\eta^{k'-l,k+l}) - f(\eta)\right).$$

As before, consider the localized product measures $\kappa_{k,k',l} = \kappa_{k,l} \times \kappa_{k',l}$ and $\kappa_{k,k',l}^{env} = \kappa_{k,l}^{env} \times \kappa_{k',l}$. Define as well as the canonical measures $\kappa_{k,k',l,j}$ and $\kappa_{k,k',l}^{env}$ on $\Omega_{k,k',l,j} := \{\eta \in \Omega_{k,k',l} : \sum_{x \in \Lambda_{k,k',l}} \eta(x) = j\}$, that is $\kappa_{k,k',l}$ and $\kappa_{k,k',l}^{env}$ conditioned so that there are exactly j particles counted in $\Omega_{k,k',l}$. With the form of the rates $\mathfrak{p}_{k+l,k'-l}^N$ and $\mathfrak{p}_{k'-l,k+l}^N$, both sets of measures are invariant and reversible for the dynamics with generators $S_{k,k',l}$ and $S_{k,k',l}^{env}$ respectively.

The corresponding Dirichlet forms $\mathscr{D}_{k,k',l}$, $\mathscr{D}_{k,k',l,j}$ and $\mathscr{D}_{k,k',l}^{env}(f)$, $\mathscr{D}_{k,k',l,j}^{env}$ are given as follows. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{D}_{k,k',l} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,x+1 \in \Lambda_{k,k',l}} E_{\kappa_{k,k',l}} \Big[g(\eta(x)) \mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^{N} \big(f(\eta^{x,x+1}) - f(\eta) \big)^{2} \Big] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} E_{\kappa_{k,k',l}} \Big[g(\eta(k+l)) \mathfrak{p}_{k+l,k'-l}^{N} \big(f(\eta^{k+l,k'-l}) - f(\eta) \big)^{2} \Big]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the canonical form $\mathscr{D}_{k,k',l,j}$ is defined except we use the measure $\kappa_{k,k',l,j}$ instead of $\kappa_{k,k',l}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{D}_{k,k',l}^{env}(f) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x \in \Lambda_{k,k',l} \setminus k \\ x+1 \in \Lambda_{k,k',l}}} E_{\kappa_{k,k',l}^{env}} \left[g(\eta(x)) \mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^{N} \left(f(\eta^{x,x+1}) - f(\eta) \right)^{2} \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} E_{\kappa_{k,k',l}^{env}} \left[g(\eta(k)) \frac{\eta(k) - 1}{\eta(k)} \mathfrak{p}_{k,+}^{N} \left(f(\eta^{k,k+1}) - f(\eta) \right)^{2} \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} E_{\kappa_{k,k',l}} \left[g(\eta(k+l)) \mathfrak{p}_{k+l,k'-l}^{N} \left(f(\eta^{k+l,k'-l}) - f(\eta) \right)^{2} \right] \end{aligned}$$

with the canonical form $\mathscr{D}_{k,k',l,j}^{env}$ defined analogously with $\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^{env}$ replacing $\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^{env}$.

Define $S_{k,k',l}^0$ and $S_{k,k',l}^{0,env}$ as the generators $S_{k,k',l}$ and $S_{k,k',l}^{env}$ when $\alpha_{\cdot}^N \equiv 0$. When |k - k'| is large, the processes generated by $S_{k,k',l}^0$ and $S_{k,k',l}^{0,env}$ may be thought of as on adjacent blocks with a connecting bond. In this sense, these processes do not depend on k, k', but only on the width l.

Let also $\kappa_{k,k',l}^0$, $\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^0$ and $\kappa_{k,k',l}^{0,env}$, $\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^{0,env}$ be the measures $\kappa_{k,k',l}$, $\kappa_{k,k',l,j}$ and $\kappa_{k,k',l}^{env}$, $\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^{env}$ when $\alpha_{k,k',l}^N \equiv 0$. Similar to (6.2), for each l and $j \geq 1$, we let $b_{l,l,j}, b_{l,l,j}^{env} > 0$ be the inverse of the spectral gaps of $-S^{0}_{k,k',l}$ and $-S^{0,env}_{k,k',l}$ on $\Omega_{k,k',l,j}$:

$$b_{l,l,j} := \inf_{f} \frac{E_{\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^{0}}[f(-S_{k,k',l}^{0}f)]}{\operatorname{Var}_{\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^{0}}(f)} \text{ and } b_{l,l,j}^{env} := \inf_{f} \frac{E_{\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^{0,env}}[f(-S_{k,k',l}^{0,env}f)]}{\operatorname{Var}_{\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^{0}}(f)}.$$

Again, we have $b_{l,l,j}^{env} \leq (g^*g_*^{-1})^2 b_{l,l,j} \leq C(g^*, g_*)l^2$, by Lemma 6.2 in [9] and (2.3), under assumptions (LG) and (M).

Let
$$r_{k,k',l,N}^{-1} := \min\left\{\mathfrak{p}_{k+l,k'-l}^N, \min_{x,x+1\in\Lambda_{k,k',l}}\left\{\mathfrak{p}_{x,+}^N\right\}\right\}.$$

Lemma 6.4. We have the following estimates:

(3)

(1) Uniform bound: For all $\eta \in \Omega_{k,k',l,j}$, we have

$$\left(\frac{\phi_{\min,k,l}}{\phi_{\max,k,l}}\right)^{2j} \left(\frac{\phi_{\min,k',l}}{\phi_{\max,k',l}}\right)^{2j} \le \frac{\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^{env}(\eta)}{\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^{0,env}(\eta)} \le \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\right)^{2j} \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k',l}}{\phi_{\min,k',l}}\right)^{2j}$$

where we recall $\phi_{\min,z,l} = \min_{x \in \Lambda_{z,l}} \phi_{x,N}$ and $\phi_{\max,z,l} = \max_{x \in \Lambda_{z,l}} \phi_{x,N}$.

(2) Poincaré inequality: For fixed $j \ge 1$ and k, k' such that |k - k'| > 2l + 1, we have $Var_{area}(f) \le C_{area}(k) + C_{area}(f) \le C_{area}(k) + C_{area}(f) \le C$

$$\text{var}_{\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^{env}(J)} \leq C_{k,k',l,j} L_{\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^{env}(J)} \left[J \left(-S_{k,k',l,j} \right) \right]$$

$$\text{where } C_{k,k',l,j} \leq C(g^*,g_*) l^2 r_{k,k',l,N} \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}} \right)^{4j} \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k',l}}{\phi_{\min,k',l}} \right)^{4j}.$$

$$\text{For each } l \text{ fixed, and } C = C(l) > 0, \text{ we have}$$

$$\lim_{N\uparrow\infty}\sup_{k,k',N}\sup_{j\leq C\log(N)}\left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\right)^{4j}\left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k',l}}{\phi_{\min,k',l}}\right)^{4j} = 1, \quad \limsup_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\sup_{N\uparrow\infty}\sup_{2l+1\leq |k'-k|\leq\epsilon N}r_{k,k',l,N} = 1.$$

Hence, for fixed l and C = C(l) > 0, we have

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \limsup_{N \uparrow \infty} \sup_{2l+1 \le |k'-k| \le \epsilon N} \sup_{j \le C \log(N)} \epsilon C_{k,k',l,j} = 0.$$

Proof. The argument follows the proof of Lemma 6.1, by comparing $\kappa_{k,k',l,j}$ with $\kappa_{k,k',l,j}^0$. However, here we have two separated intervals. Since $\kappa_{k,k',l}$ and $\kappa_{k,k',l}^0$ factor into products indexed over these intervals, we may proceed. Indeed, by comparing fugacities in $\Lambda_{k,l}$ with $\phi_{min,k,l}$ and $\phi_{max,k,l}$ and those in $\Lambda_{k',l}$ with $\phi_{min,k',l}$ and $\phi_{max,k',l}$, the analog of (6.3) is

$$\left(\frac{\phi_{\min,k,l}}{\phi_{\max,k,l}}\right)^{2j} \left(\frac{\phi_{\min,k',l}}{\phi_{\max,k',l}}\right)^{2j} \le \frac{\kappa_{k,k',l}^{env}(\eta)}{\kappa_{k,k',l}^{0,env}(\eta)} \le \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k,l}}{\phi_{\min,k,l}}\right)^{2j} \left(\frac{\phi_{\max,k',l}}{\phi_{\min,k',l}}\right)^{2j}.$$

The rest of the argument for Part 1, and Parts 2,3 are similar as for the 1-block Lemma 6.1. We only note that here $\mathfrak{p}_{k+l,k'-l}^N$ converges to 1 as $N \uparrow \infty$, $\epsilon \downarrow 0$, by Lemma 2.1.

We state now a centering lemma, similar to Lemma 6.2. Recall that H is bounded and Lipschitz, as stated in the proof of Lemma 4.1 after (4.4).

Lemma 6.5. We have, for C = C(l) > 0 depending on l, that

$$\limsup_{\ell \to \infty} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{T}_N \\ y \in \{2\ell+1, \dots, \epsilon N\}}} \sup_{j \le C \log N} \left| E_{\kappa_{x,x+y,l,j}}[H(\eta^{\ell}(x)) - H(\eta^{\ell}(x+y))] \right| = 0.$$

Proof. Since H is bounded, we may reduce to the homogeneous case by using the same steps and approach as in Lemma 6.2. However, we invoke Lemma 6.6 in [9] to deduce the limit in the homogeneous case, when $\alpha^{N} \equiv 0$.

We now come to the main estimate of the section.

Lemma 6.6 (Local 2-block). With the same notation as in Lemma 4.1,

$$\limsup_{\ell \to \infty} \limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^{N} \left[\left| \int_{0}^{t} D_{X_{s}^{N}}^{N} \left(H(\eta_{s}^{\ell}(X_{s}^{N})) - \frac{1}{\epsilon N} \sum_{x=1}^{\epsilon N} H(\eta_{s}^{\ell}(X_{s}^{N} + x)) \right) ds \right| \right] = 0.$$

Proof. Let $V_{\ell,x,y}(\eta) = D_x^N (H(\eta^\ell(x)) - H(\eta^\ell(x+y)))$. Since H and D_{\cdot}^N are uniformly bounded, so is $V_{\ell,x,y}$ for all $y \in \mathbb{T}_N$. Therefore,

$$H(\eta^{\ell}(x)) - \frac{1}{\epsilon N} \sum_{y=1}^{\epsilon N} H(\eta^{\ell}(x+y)) = \frac{1}{\epsilon N} \sum_{y=1}^{\epsilon N} V_{\ell,x,y}(\eta) \le O\left(\frac{\ell}{\epsilon N}\right) + \frac{1}{\epsilon N} \sum_{y=2\ell+1}^{\epsilon N} V_{\ell,x,y}(\eta).$$

The first term on the right hand side vanishes as $N \to \infty$. To bound the second term, it is enough to show

$$\limsup_{\ell \to \infty} \limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \sup_{y \in \{2\ell+1, \dots, \epsilon N\}} \mathbb{E}^{N} \left[\left| \int_{0}^{t} V_{\ell, X_{s}^{N}, y}(\eta_{s}) \, ds \right| \right] = 0.$$

We may proceed as in the proof of the local 1-block Lemma 6.3 so that it suffices to show

$$\begin{split} \limsup_{\ell \to \infty} \limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \sup_{N \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \sup_{y \in \{2\ell+1, \dots, \epsilon N\}} \sup_{\|f\|_{L^2(\nu^{env,x})} = 1} \langle V_{\ell,x,y} \mathbb{1}_{G_{N,\ell}}, f^2 \rangle_{\nu^{env,x}} - \frac{N}{\gamma} \mathscr{D}^{env,x}(f) = 0 \end{split}$$

where $G_{N,\ell} = \{(x,\eta) : \eta^{\ell}(x) + \eta^{\ell}(x+y) \le C \log N\}$ and $\gamma > 0$ is a fixed constant.

We now assert that

$$\mathscr{D}_{x,x+y,l}^{env}(f) \leq C_1(1+\epsilon N) \mathscr{D}^{env,x}(f).$$

Indeed, note that $\mathscr{D}_{x,x+y,l}^{env}$ consists of the sum of Dirichlet forms $\mathscr{D}_{x,l}^{env}(f)$, $\mathscr{D}_{x+y,\ell}(f)$ and the Dirichlet bond from $x + \ell$ to $x + y - \ell$. Now, Step 5 of Lemma 7.2 in [15] directly bounds the Dirichlet bond by $\epsilon N \mathscr{D}'(f)$ where $\mathscr{D}'(f)$ consists of Dirichlet bonds in $\mathscr{D}^{env,x}(f)$ not involving x. Therefore, $\mathscr{D}'(f) \leq \mathscr{D}^{env,x}(f)$ and the claim follows.

Therefore, after localization and conditioning on the number of particles j, it suffices to show

$$\begin{split} \limsup_{\ell \to \infty} \limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \sup_{N \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N, y \in \{2\ell+1, \dots, \epsilon N\}} \sup_{j \le C(\ell) \log(N)} \sup_{\|f\|_{L^2(\kappa_{x,x+y,\ell,j}^{env})} = 1} \\ \langle V_{\ell,x,y}, f^2 \rangle_{\nu_{\kappa_{x,x+y,\ell,j}}^{env}} - \frac{1}{2\epsilon \gamma C_1} \mathscr{D}_{x,x+y,\ell,j}^{env}(f) = 0. \end{split}$$

We may replace $V_{\ell,x,y}$ by the centered expression $\widetilde{V}_{\ell,x,y} = V_{\ell,x,y} - E_{\kappa_{x,x+y,\ell,j}}[V_{\ell,x,y}]$ in the above limit, since by Lemma 6.5, $E_{\kappa_{x,x+y,\ell,j}}[V_{l,x,y}]$ vanishes uniformly in the limits and restrictions given. Then, to handle the centered $\widetilde{V}_{\ell,x,y}$ by Rayleigh expansion and Poincaré inequality, via Lemma 6.4, we obtain

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{T}_{N}} \sup_{2\ell+1\leq y\leq\epsilon N} \sup_{j\leq C(\ell)} \sup_{\log(N)} \sup_{\|f\|_{L^{2}(\kappa_{x,x+y,\ell,j}^{env})} = 1} \langle \widetilde{V}_{\ell,x,y}, f^{2} \rangle_{\kappa_{x,x+y,\ell,j}^{env}} - \frac{1}{2\epsilon\gamma C_{1}} \mathscr{D}_{x,x+y,\ell,j}^{env}(f)$$

$$\leq \sup_{x\in\mathbb{T}_{N}, y\in\{2\ell+1,\dots,\epsilon N\}} \sup_{j\leq C(\ell)\log N} \frac{2\epsilon\gamma C_{1}C_{x,x+y,\ell,j} \|\widetilde{V}_{\ell,x,y}\|_{L^{2}(\kappa_{x,x+y,\ell,j}^{env})}}{1-2\epsilon\gamma C_{1}C_{x,x+y,\ell,j} \|\widetilde{V}_{\ell,x,y}\|_{\infty}^{2}}.$$

The right-hand side vanishes as $N \to \infty$ by Part 3 of Lemma 6.4, noting that H and D^N_{\cdot} are uniformly bounded.

6.3. Global Replacement. We now indicate the 'global' replacement to handle the third term in (4.4) in the proof of Lemma 4.1. We will be able to replace the average of $H(\eta_t^{\ell}(X_t^N+x))$ for x in a small macroscopic ϵN neighborhood of X_t^N by the average of $\overline{H_\ell}(\eta_t^{\theta N}(X_t^N+x))$ over x in the the same ϵN neighborhood. After some manipulation, this 'global' replacement can be recovered from the proof of the hydrodynamics Lemma 5.1 in [15], that is the proof of Theorem 2.7.

Lemma 6.7 (Global Replacement). With the same notation as in Lemma 4.1,

$$\begin{split} \limsup_{\ell \to \infty} \limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{\theta \to 0} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \\ \mathbb{E}^{N} \left[\left| \int_{0}^{t} D_{X_{s}^{N}}^{N} \Big(\frac{1}{\epsilon N} \sum_{x=1}^{\epsilon N} H(\eta_{s}^{\ell}(X_{s}^{N} + x)) - \overline{H_{\ell}}(\eta_{s}^{\theta N}(X_{s}^{N} + x)) \Big) \, ds \right| \right] = 0. \end{split}$$

Proof. We can rewrite the expectation as

ł

$$\mathbb{E}^{N}\left[\left|\int_{0}^{t} D_{X_{s}^{N}}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}_{N}}\iota_{\epsilon}(x/N)\left\{H(\eta_{s}^{\ell}(X_{s}^{N}+x))-\overline{H_{\ell}}(\eta_{s}^{\theta N}(X_{s}^{N}+x))\right\}\right)ds\right|\right]$$

where $\iota_{\epsilon}(x) = \epsilon^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{(0,\epsilon]}$. We may change variables $X_s^N + x$ to z, and then limit the sum over z to $|X_s^N - z| \ge 2\theta N$, as H and D_{\cdot}^N are uniformly bounded, with an error of $C(||H||_{\infty}, \sup_N ||D_{\cdot}^N||_{\infty})\theta$. We need only consider $\mathbb{E}^N \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{|X_s^N - z| \ge 2\theta N} \left| \int_0^t D_{X_s^N - z}^N \left(H(\eta_s^{\ell}(z)) - \overline{H_{\ell}}(\eta_s^{\theta N}(z)) \right) ds \right| \right]$.

Let $V_{\ell,\upsilon}(z,x,\eta) = D_{x-z}^N (H(\eta^\ell(z)) - \overline{H_\ell}(\eta^\upsilon(z)))$. The desired limit will follow if we show, for fixed $\ell > 0$, that

$$\limsup_{\theta \to 0} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^{N} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{|X_{s}^{N} - z| \ge 2\theta N} \left| \int_{0}^{t} V_{\ell,\theta N}(z, X_{s}^{N}, \eta_{s}) \, ds \right| \right] = 0.$$
(6.8)

The argument for (6.8) follows that of Lemma 5.1 in [15], which separates into (global) '1block' and '2-block' estimates, namely Lemmas 6.2 and 7.2 in [15]. Here, H is a bounded, Lipschitz function of ℓ sites, where ℓ is fixed, whereas in [15], the function dealt with there was of only one site. Still, the same scheme holds as in the translation-invariant case in [13]; see also [9], [10] for analogous treatments. We only mention the main steps for the (global) '1-block' as the (global) '2-block' is similar.

For the '1-block' estimate, we need to show

$$\limsup_{\lambda \to \infty} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^{N} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{|X_{s}^{N} - z| > 2\theta N} \left| \int_{0}^{t} V_{\ell,\lambda}(z, X_{s}^{N}, \eta_{s}) \, ds \right| \right] = 0,$$

introducing an intermediate scale λ . As in the proof of Lemma 6.3 in [15], one may introduce a truncation via the entropy inequality, as g satisfies the (FEM) condition (cf. Section 2.3), so that one need only show

$$\limsup_{\lambda \to \infty} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^{N} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{|X_{s}^{N} - z| > 2\theta N} \left| \int_{0}^{t} \left(V_{\ell,\lambda}(z, X_{s}^{N}, \eta_{s}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\eta_{s}^{\lambda}(z) \le A\}} \right) ds \right| \right] = 0.$$

By using the entropy inequality and eigenvalue decompositions, conditioning on $x \in \mathbb{T}_N$, as in the 'local' 1 and 2-block arguments for Lemmas 6.3 and 6.6, it suffices to prove, for stationary inhomogeneous measures $\nu^{env,x}$ and constant $\gamma > 0$, that

$$\begin{split} \limsup_{\lambda \to \infty} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \sup_{\|f\|_{L^2(\nu^{env}, x)} = 1} \\ \Big\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_{|x-z| \geq 2\theta N} V_{\ell, \lambda}(z, x, \eta) \, \mathbbm{1}_{\{\eta^{\lambda}(z) \leq A\}}) \, f, f \Big\rangle_{\nu^{env, x}} - \frac{N}{\gamma} \mathscr{D}^{env, x}(f) = 0. \end{split}$$

Since $V_{\ell,\lambda}(x, z, \eta) \mathbb{1}_{\{\eta^{\lambda}(z) \leq A\}}$ does not depend on $\eta(x)$, we may condition f on variables which do not depend on $\eta(x)$, the location x being where the tagged particle is fixed. In this way, one can replace the measure $\nu^{env,x}$ with \mathscr{R}_N , and $\mathscr{D}^{env,x}(f)$ evaluates to the Dirichlet form with respect to the standard process $\langle f, -Lf \rangle_{\mathscr{R}_N}$ (cf. remark after (6.1)). It would suffice to show, now uniformly over z, that

$$\begin{split} \limsup_{\lambda \to \infty} \sup_{N \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}_N} \sup_{z: |x-z| \ge 2\theta N} \sup_{\|f\|_{L^2(\mathscr{R}_N)} = 1} \\ & \left\langle V_{\ell,\lambda}(z, x, \eta) \mathbb{1}_{\{\eta^{\lambda}(z) \le A\}} f, f \right\rangle_{\mathscr{R}_N} - \frac{N}{\gamma} \langle f, -Lf \rangle_{\mathscr{R}_N} = 0. \end{split}$$

By the proof of Lemma 6.3 (page 220) in [15], one may replace $V_{\ell,\lambda}(z, x, \eta)$ by its 'centering' $D_{x-z}^N \Big(H(\eta^\ell(z)) - E_{\kappa_{z,\lambda,(2\lambda+1)\eta^\lambda(z)}}[H(\eta^\lambda(z))] \Big)$ when $\eta^\lambda(z) \leq A$, with a uniform over x, z error vanishing as $N \to \infty$.

At this point, one follows the same argument for Lemma 6.3 (page 221-222) in [15] to complete the argument for the (global) '1-block'. \Box

References

- [1] Andjel, E. (1982) Invariant measures for the zero range process. Ann. Probab. 10 525–547.
- Bahouri, H., Chemin, J.-Y., Danchin, R. (2011) Fourier Analysis and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations. Springer, Berlin.
- [3] Brox, T. (1986) A one-dimensional diffusion process in a Wiener medium. Ann. Probab. 14 1206-1218.
- [4] Conroy, M., Sethuraman, S. (2023) Gumbel laws in the symmetric exclusion process. Commun. Math. Phys. 402 723-764.
- [5] Funaki, T., Xie, B. (2022) Global solvability and convergence to stationary solutions in singular quasilinear stochastic PDEs. Stoch. PDE: Anal. Comp. 10 858–897.
- [6] Funaki, T., Hoshino, M., Sethuraman, S., Xie, B. (2021) Asymptotics of PDE in random environment by paracontrolled calculus. Ann. IHP Probab. Stat. 57 1702–1735.
- [7] Gihman, I.I., Skorohod, A.V. (1979) The Theory of Stochastic Processes III. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 232, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [8] Gubinelli, M., Imkeller, P., Perkowski, N. (2015) Paracontrolled distributions and singular PDEs. Forum. Math. Pi 3 1–75.
- [9] Jara, M.D., Landim, C., Sethuraman, S. (2009) Nonequilibrium fluctuations for a tagged particle in mean-zero one-dimensional zero-range processes. *Probab. Theory Rel. Fields* 145 565–590.
- [10] Jara, M.D., Landim, C., Sethuraman, S. (2013) Nonequilibrium fluctuations for a tagged particle in onedimensional sublinear zero-range processes. Ann. IHP Probab. Stat. 49611–637.
- [11] Kallenberg, O. (1996) On the existence of universal functional solutions to classical sde's. Ann. Probab. 24 196-205.
- [12] Karatzas, I. and Shreve, S. (1991) Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus. Second-Edition, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 113, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [13] Kipnis, C., and Landim, C. (1998) Scaling Limits of Interacting Particle Systems. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 320, Springer, Berlin.
- [14] Ladyženskaja, O.A., Solonnikov, V.A., Ural'ceva, N.N. (1968) LInear and Quasi-linear Equations of Parabolic Type Translations Math. Monographs, 23, American Mathematical Society.
- [15] Landim, C., Pacheco, C.G., Sethuraman, S., Xue, J. (2023) On a nonlinear SPDE derived from a hydrodynamic limit in a Sinai-type random environment, Ann. Appl. Probab. 33 200–237.
- [16] Landim, C., Sethuraman, S., Varadhan, S.R.S. (1996) Spectral gap for zero-range dynamics. Ann. Probab. 24 1871–1902.
- [17] Lieberman, G. (1996) Second Order Parabolic Differential Equations. World Scientific, Singapore.
- [18] Liggett, T.M. (1985) Interacting Particle Systems. Classics in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin.
- [19] Revuz, D. and Yor, M. (2004) Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 293 Springer-Verlag, Berlin
- [20] Seignourel, P. (2000) Discrete schemes for processes in random medium. Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 118 293–322.
- [21] Sethuraman, S. (2007) On diffusivity of a tagged particle in asymmetric zero-range dynamics, Ann. IHP Probab. Stat. 43 215–232.
- [22] Sinai, Y. (1982) The limit behavior of a one-dimensional random walk Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen. 27 247–258.

- [23] Spohn, H. (1991) Large Scale Dynamics of Interacting Particles. Texts and Monographs in Physics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [24] Stroock, D., Varadhan, S.R.S. (1979) Multidimensional Diffusion Processes. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, 621 N. SANTA RITA AVE., TUCSON, AZ 85750, USA *Email address:* marcelh@arizona.edu

IMPA, ESTRADA DONA CASTORINA 110, CEP 22460, RIO DE JANEIRO, BRASIL AND CNRS UPRES A 6085, UNIVERSITÉ DE ROUEN, 76801 MONT SAINT AIGNAN CEDEX, FRANCE.

Email address: landim@impa.br

MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, 621 N. SANTA RITA AVE., TUCSON, AZ 85750, USA *Email address:* sethuram@arizona.edu